School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1359624

MY PRIESTHOOD

WALTER J. CAREY

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Read

Indorsed.

MY PRIESTHOOD

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE LIFE IN GRACE.

With an Introduction by the

BISHOP OF LONDON.

Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
London, New York, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras.

N
660
C3

MY PRIESTHOOD

BY

WALTER J. CAREY, M.A.

LIBRARIAN OF PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD
AUTHOR OF 'THE LIFE IN GRACE'

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1915

All rights reserved

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

DEDICATED TO

THE BISHOP OF LONDON

TO WHOM I

IN COMMON WITH ALL OLD OXFORD UNDERGRADUATES

OWE MUCH MORE

THAN WE CAN EVER VENTURE TO EXPRESS

PREFACE

It has frequently been my lot to address ordination candidates on the eve of their ordination. I have had to do this for various theological colleges, and once for the Bishop of London before his winter ordination. Also at Oxford one meets a great many future clergy, and I have given series of addresses 'to those who are considering the possibility of ordination.' These were very well attended, and those who came seemed interested, but I was conscious of a vast deal of ignorance as to what the priestly life was, and what were the right lines of work for a priest who was determined to be rightly professional, and not simply an amateur. I remembered with shame my own pre-ordination vagueness on the subject, and my own failures since. Yet I am clear of this at least, that an ideal has emerged for me, by God's grace, of what a priest should be, and what he should do, at least on the main lines. It is difficult for me to trace how this vision arose, but certain figures stand out as I think things over. I was much impressed when an undergraduate by meeting Father Woodward, of the Society of the Sacred Mission, and

of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. He struck me as a new type, and though I have only seen him for a few hours in my life, yet he still remains a personality. He was obviously humble and companionable, quite without airs or patronising ways, yet he was both a man and a priest. That he was a priest was unmistakable; one felt that he was priestly in fibre and in grain. I always had a horror of the clerical clergyman who acts and speaks in the conventional clerical way. Yet here I had met a man obviously real, obviously priestly, obviously to be respected. It was a bit of a revelation.

Then I ran across Father Dolling and Father Stanton. Grave people tell you that they had their faults. I expect they had. Yet one great blazing fact burned out from them. They were men who suffered much and loved much. It was the sum of their whole lives that they loved their Lord with a simple, clear, burning, all-embracing love. And because of their supreme grasp of the Incarnation, which taught them that Jesus was really Man, they truly loved the items, the individuals, of that Humanity which their Master had taken into union with Himself. They saw every sinful soul of man 'sub specie Jesu,' or rather they saw Jesus under the aspect of every human being; prostitute, drunkard, outcast—if you looked keenly enough at them, there was the form the face, of Jesus Himself still surviving amid the wreckage. Most of us are not able so to love, at least not yet. Our little under-powered hearts can

love a little, can love a few. But these men had the genius of love. Their hearts were almost over-engined—at least for their own strength or happiness. Hence they loved and they suffered. The secret of both their faults and their virtues was in this. When you love humanity as these two did, you do not measure your words. You are impatient of regu-ations, of conventional people, of those in authority. Ideally one should be an upholder of authority and yet a daring reformer. Sometimes they failed: they spoke too bitterly of Bishops, they were blind to the merits which the Church of England does possess. Yet, for myself, they formed and form three-quarters of my ideal. They loved. Without love, what is left worth having? Love may need its own machinery, its officials, its organisation for work, but all these without love are mere ashes without fire. These men were true lovers of God, lovers of humanity. Then my brother taught me to venerate Dean Church. I think the Dolling-Stanton ideal is deficient without him. His weight, his judgment, his knowledge, his character, his truthfulness are simply beyond price. I have often been brought up against the Roman controversy, and have seen how some men are torn between their love of Roman efficiency and good craftsmanship on the one hand, and their inward conviction that the Church of England after all conserves something worth keeping; some-thing like that 'sound knowledge' of which Bishop Creighton spoke. How often a man is tempted

to juggle with his conscience, putting over-emphasis on some unfortunate episcopal utterance or on some slackness of organisation, in order to justify the step he wishes to take. That is where Dean Church comes in. He looked at truth straight, and tried to ignore nothing, to conceal nothing. He hated rounded conclusions which mislaid some of the evidence, and generalisations which ignored awkward facts: he knew that there were many questions which may be asked but cannot be answered; he was willing to wait, to life's end if necessary, rather than give way to the impatience which must have an answer, though the materials for a true answer are wanting. It is always rather invidious to speak of the living, yet I suspect that some of the ingredients of my ideal are shared by many priests to-day. The Bishop of Oxford comes into it, and the Bishop of London with his love for souls. Dr. Holland also, with his great gift of transforming religion from a dull round of duties painfully done, into a drama of intensest interest and a life of romantic achievement and splendid horizons. I owe too much to Dr. Stone to dare to try and express my debt to him, but to those who know him he is a rock of patience, serenity, and power of waiting. The ideal needs him too. I trust I have not been impertinent in naming these names, but I do so partly out of deepest gratitude to them, and partly to show the sort of lines on which I wish to present those ideals of the priesthood which follow. If you mixed together all these names—and all they

stand for—and then poured them out in a mould, that would represent very fairly the ideal of the priesthood which I would commend to a younger generation.

It is the Catholic ideal I believe: neither ultramontane nor protestant. Catholic and evangelical; orthodox yet liberal; convinced yet charitable.

It allows for exceptions, yet does not make the exceptions into a new rule: it believes in a 'faith once delivered,' yet allows for subsequent interpretations by a Living Society; it centres on Christ the Saviour, yet sees in the Church and the Sacraments the Bride of Christ and the Means of Grace.

And because a priest ought to know his work, I venture to lay down definite lines because I am sure that the time is past for amateurs, and that we need men who are not less professional—not less versed in the science of souls—than expert professors in any other science who know their own subject, and are masters of it.

W. J. CAREY.

January 25, 1915.

This book has been passed through the Press while the author was on the high seas acting as a Naval Chaplain. Dr. Darwell Stone kindly undertook the task of revising the MS. and the proofs in order that the issue of the book should not be delayed.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE MOTIVE OF ORDINATION	1
II.	WHAT WE ARE IN FOR, AS PRIESTS . .	6
III.	HOW DOES ONE BECOME A COMPETENT AND PROFESSIONAL PRIEST?	18
IV.	THE SORT OF CHARACTERS WE WANT TO PRODUCE	35
V.	THE PRIEST AS PASTOR	39
VI.	THE PRIEST AS PRIEST	60
VII.	THE PRIEST AS MISSIONER	98
VIII.	THE PRIEST'S DIFFICULTIES AND TEMPTATIONS	144

MY PRIESTHOOD

CHAPTER I

THE MOTIVE OF ORDINATION

WHY are any of us ever ordained ? It ought to be a terribly exacting life, and the joys of it, though far the most satisfying in the world, lie at very high levels only reached through effort, sweat, and pain.

And most of us, as we embark on this priestly life, not only have no experience, but probably no idea of the sort of life and work and peril in the venture we are making. Even the Roman ordinand, who is as carefully and scientifically trained as most of us are (or used to be) the reverse, can have little idea of the actualities of the priestly heart and temper. It is only in the actual experience, in the inexpressible joy of helping to save the sinner or to enlarge the vision of a saint, that we come to the inner meaning and value of true priestliness. That is why I wonder again and again why so many are ordained.

I daresay a great many come to it (and by the mercy of God turn out efficient priests) by the unexciting process of drifting into it. Their parents hoped they

would; they came up to the university with the prospect of the ministry or a schoolmaster-ship since they were not clever enough for the Civil Service, nor rich enough for the Bar. There they were possibly idle and vague, and the ministry after all is a profession with a definite status which you can enter with the minimum of technical knowledge. No doubt things should be different, but I suspect that the authorities of the Church are eager to get enough candidates to keep the hack-work of the Church going, and are moreover afraid of a too technical and searching examination which would admit Cæsar Borgia or Talleyrand but would certainly plough the Apostles and St. Francis of Assisi. I am afraid, all the same, that this training through a public-school and a university makes possible the class of clergy we all dread to meet or to become; a class who are simply not converted, and are content with routine services and conventional church-going. These are they who never agonise over their lost sheep, never weep in their souls because there are only a hundred communicants in a parish of five thousand; these are the useless shepherds who cannot see in every lamb of their flock a potential hero and knight in the shining army of God.

Yet among us drifters there is sometimes a motive at work dimly discerned, yet not altogether wanting. It is the call of God. In a sort of vague way we hear the voice of God telling us that although every man can be His servant and friend, whether doctor or

soldier, ploughman or politician, yet there is a special ministerial work, and for this service He needs us. The purple passage in Isaiah vi., 'Whom shall I send, and who will go for US?' has its faint reflection in our lethargic hearts; in a faint sort of way we reply, 'Here am I, send me.' We do not quite understand why we respond, we are conscious of no overmastering vocation, yet things conspire to lead us to this sort of life, the general flow and current of events floats us to it. We get into the habit of thinking that we shall probably be ordained; we sometimes think of other professions, yet when we are at our best we recur to this one. There are many doubtless who are clear from the start, to whom no other sort of life is possible, yet I think most of us were otherwise; it came to us rather than we to it. And another motive, perhaps rather clearer to us than the voice of God, is the call of humanity. We recognise that all is not well in the world. Our observation tells us, or our school and college missions remind us, that there is something amiss with the world. We hear of slums and dreary hopeless lives: we instinctively feel that around us is a sick and unhappy world which needs physicians, human as well as Divine. If we have ceased to say our prayers this perception fades away, and we pass out into some profession where our main interest centres round ourselves, and so join the serried ranks of those whose ambitions are largely selfish or confined to the little limited and—so to speak—suburban world of our own interests

and acquaintances. But if we pray, our outlook enlarges. We perceive ourselves as part of a larger world which is in need, and is beset with restlessness and suffering. If we are converted, or are becoming converted, we intuitively perceive the main remedy for a diseased world. It is in the love of God and the salvation given to us by and in Jesus that the wounds of the world will be healed. There are many side remedies, of course—social amelioration, a supply of legitimate pleasures and recreations, political and other kinds of emancipation—but we feel that all this network of social service and regeneration does not really touch the root. It is external to a great degree. It does not heal the heart that knows its own bitterness ; it may well result only in a substitution of refined selfishness for gross selfishness ; it is possible to have one or more votes, to live under the Government of one's own choosing, to have double the regulated amount of fresh air in one's bedroom, to be educated and well informed, and yet to be a bad man—unhappy, restless, pathetic. We know from our experience that the love of God and the indwelling of Christ in the submitted will and converted heart, is not a mere invention of maiden aunts who have asked God to take possession of their hearts because there was no human bidding. We know that religion is in itself a force, a power, a possession, full of sweetness and energy. As forcible as the possession of a soul by an evil spirit, is the possession of the heart by the Holy Spirit of God. We learn to scout the

idea that religion is a vague, feminine, self-evolved, and sentimental aspiration after unrealities. On the contrary, it is the being possessed by a very volcano of power, light, and peace.

So it is that, when we are gradually getting sure of all this, we begin to desire to spend our life in propagating this healing doctrine and acting as physicians to the sick souls of men. As passionately as a good doctor wills and works for physical health, we will and work for spiritual health. But when once a man realises that : once he grasps that he is really willing to give his life for this service, then ordination stands very near him. For the priesthood is the professional class of those who give their main time and care and interest to healing souls and bringing them into that relationship with God which is spiritual health.

Other men may help. The layman has his priesthood, and there are prophets. But the official, ministerial priest makes it his profession ; he is empowered by God to go and heal the souls of men, and do nothing else.

Thus, if men want to know the motives of their ordination, they will find them here, in the call of God, and the needs of sick and sorrowful humanity to which they are called to minister.

CHAPTER II

WHAT WE ARE IN FOR, AS PRIESTS

We are going then into the world as priests to heal the souls of men and reconstitute them into health and happiness; that is, to get them right with God. And for that purpose we enter into human life as a man lets himself down into the water. We do not stand above our people as if we were a superior lot of super-men who are kind enough to patronise the herd of outsiders. Do let us remember that. We are of them, not above them; it is very good of them to listen to us at all. Have done once and for all with any idea that we descend upon them to patronise them graciously. We are no better than they are, probably worse, but we submit to them that we have a message from God. It is not *our* message, *our* culture, *our* superior ways we communicate to them; they have as much right to their ways (unless they contravene the common welfare) as we have. Therefore let us never be hurt or chagrined if they do not listen to *us*. It is very probably our fault; our feeble presentation, issuing from a cold or unconverted heart, does not bite on them. A real man of God will always

have listeners. Our business is very humbly to persuade, to plead: we have a right to do that. And our mission is to persuade them that we come to them with a message from God (which He has graciously made clear to us) concerning the end of mankind and their own end in particular. We are sure that some will listen, because the end which we propose to them is one which their heart in its best moods is already unconsciously seeking. What is this end of man? It is *union with God*. This is the complete, final, exhaustive account of the purpose of man's creation. All else is auxiliary or subsidiary to that. The Incarnation itself, the Bible, the sacraments, services, teachings, classes, meetings, preachings, are all means to one single clear end—union with God.

By that test you weigh all things. The Incarnation, the Bible as a whole, the sacraments, are beyond criticism (once Christianity is accepted), because they are God's instruments for bringing men to union with Himself; but our manner of administering sacraments, our meetings, our preachments, every individual sermon, must pass this test or else be jettisoned as useless and impertinent—'Does this bring souls nearer union with God?' Sacraments (including the Incarnation and the Bible) are doubtless beyond our criticism, but all else we should criticise freely and boldly. For instance: if you find yourself in charge of a parish whose institutions cannot stand this test, alter them or abolish them frankly and vigorously. Does your men's club bring souls

nearer to God? If not, abolish it. Of course I include, among things which lead souls to God, both human brotherliness and human recreation, but if your club leads to, and ends in, a standard which stunts rather than develops the spiritual life, alter it or stop it. If you find that your parochial charities are a patronage of the poor, giving them by dole what justice should have given by right, alter your methods, for they only lead souls away from God. Give still to the poor, but alter the spirit of giving: give as redressing a wrong, not as exhibiting the patronage of the 'deserving' to the 'undeserving.' Test your tools—your parochial machinery—by this test. Apply the test to *everything*. Your way of celebrating the Holy Mysteries, your reverence at baptisms, your manner of speech when called to some unexpected or inconvenient task,[1] your behaviour in church, your disposal of your time, as well as to the larger systems of work which obtain in your parish. Perhaps I ought to mention here that the only way to apply this test without getting self-conscious is to keep one's eye upon God and His approval, and then all these things will work out right automatically; but all the same it is true that God tests us all the time by the same touchstone. 'Are you, are your methods, is your life, leading my wandering children to Myself?'

If our aim is to lead human hearts to God we must

[1] *e.g.* when you have been sitting long at hearing confessions and are tired, and have just risen and taken off your surplice, it sometimes happens that some one turns up late, and you have to turn to again. It is trying, but *never show it.*

next inquire as to the right roads by which to conduct them to God. What are the paths that lead to this union? For us Christians there is only one answer —Christ. He is the Way to God; we must lead our people to God by Him. Union with God necessitates —and this is the Gospel—life in Christ, life for Christ. Men have sought the way to God always. They have tried to reach Him through philosophy, through asceticism, through Mithraism, through Buddhism, through the Greek mysteries, through Mohammedanism. They have sought Him through animal sacrifice, through human sacrifice. Every act of worship and sacrifice, however degraded and primitive, had its origin in the desire to get at God, to find Him Whom the untutored human heart dimly apprehended. Who knows if the seekers have not found? But there is revealed to us, by the mercy of God, God's own way of our finding Him, and that is 'in Christ.' This was the purpose of the Incarnation, that men might find union with Christ (through faith and love and sacramental contact), and 'in Christ' might find union with the Father. Christ is the Bridge—spanning the gulf between God and man because He is God and man. You pass into Christ at the human end of the Bridge, and you pass out at the Divine end into the life of the Eternal Father. Christ is the medium, the go-between, the way by which a human being passes up into the life of God. To get to God you must get into Christ. There is no other way. People try all manner of other ways, and who of us

is to mock or condemn? but there is only one way revealed of God, and that is Christ. So many of us want to get to God by our own ways. 'Isn't one religion as good as another?' 'Isn't every honest man equally right?' Certainly; so far as honesty goes and effort goes, one is as good as another. But it is not a question of honesty and effort, it is a question as to which is *God's* road. The honesty and effort of two persons who desire to get from London to York may be equal, but if one starts towards Sheffield and the other towards Brighton, the first will get there, and the second, so far as we can tell, will not. If some authority gave them both a route-map, surely we should reckon it as kindness, as the revelation of the best way. So God has given us a revelation of the road to Himself, and that road is Christ. We do not say we are better men than Mohammedans or Buddhists; we do say that we are convinced that God's high-road is not Buddhism or Mohammedanism, but Christ, and we persuade men to try the same road. Surely we cannot be blamed for that. We do not say, 'Here, you immoral and blind Buddhist, see what wonderful people we Christians are'; we say to them humbly, yet confidently, 'We, your fellow pilgrims in this difficult and dusty road called Life, have found a way which leads us to peace and heartsease. We are convinced that it is revealed by the God Whom we seek to worship in common. Will you examine the Christian credentials and try the Christian life, and see whether it may not help you too? Our

motive for telling you about it is this : we believe it to be the truth of God, and therefore you ought to know it ; we believe that it gives health and peace and power, and therefore we—your brothers—would like you to have it.'

That seems to me our only justifiable motive for mission work of any kind. And what we say to Buddhists we say to the people of our parish. Nominally they are supposed to be Christians already, but we must not presume too much on that. We approach them humbly—as unworthy possessors of a wonderful and blessed secret—and ask them to listen. If they do not wish to hear we must not be hurt or call them names. They have the dignity of human beings, and we must always treat them with respect. Our Lord treated publicans and harlots with great respect : were they not human beings, with free wills, capable of union with God, not to be despaired of ? How terrible it is when we forget this, and hurl an unsympathetic message at our people, and abuse or even hate them because they do not listen ! We mistake ourselves—we are lording it over God's heritage. Weep, if you like, that they are rejecting what belongs to their peace, but never, never lose patience with them, or act in such a way as to suggest it was your own self-esteem that was hurt, or your own message rejected. We must just patiently continue to say (with variations), 'You are made for union with God, and Christ is the mediator ; one day I hope and believe you will understand and listen

and be saved.' Thus we seek to bring men to Christ.

But what next ? I think it is a really obscure and difficult proposition when we say to anyone, ' Christ is the Way,' or, ' Find Christ.' The theologian understands it, the converted man feels it, but the man in the street, in his simple way, only thinks you are talking drivel—and I must say I sympathise with him. So we must go on to explain what this ' Life in Christ ' means. It implies a certain knowledge about Christ and His life and claims ; it proceeds to a definite acceptance of Christ as Master and Saviour. This acceptance is suddenly or gradually made. What a step this is ! only the soul itself can make it. You can create the atmosphere in which this sort of acceptance becomes possible and likely, but you cannot do it *for* your people any more than you can fall in love *for* them, though you may be able to tell them about love, and make things easy for them to fall into it.

After this step, generally known as conversion, you proceed to point to the Sacraments. You explain that they are Christ's own special and appointed ' Means of Grace '—points at which we meet Him by His own command, where we are definitely certain to find Him, and receive from Him then and there that communication of His own Life and Presence which it is the object and nature of each Sacrament to give us. Sacraments let the Life of Christ into us, if we could only understand it : the process is spiritual, yet real ; Sacraments unite us, join us, to Christ.

'Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.' That saying was fulfilled in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, and it needs thinking over a good deal now, as then (St. John vi.). But the right explanation of it is this: that we get into union with Christ by submitting our wills to Him (conversion) and by spiritually sharing His life (Sacraments).

In baptism we are spiritually born into Him; in Holy Communion we reach the climax of a spiritually full-grown manhood or womanhood in receiving into our life the very communicated Life of Christ Himself.

All this is not easy, though the simile of the vine and its branches helps us a great deal. It is also largely unknown to the vast majority of our people, with the astonishing and distressing result that among those who call themselves Christians, the services and Means of Grace which the Lord Himself instituted are the very ones most neglected.

Was there ever a clearer command than this: 'Do this in remembrance of Me'? Yet we all know how it is neglected. It is neglected partly as being part of a Christian's life and profession, from which men naturally shrink because it is difficult: partly because the Sacrament itself is not understood. It is no matter of High Church or Low Church—we all lament the paucity of our communicants.

There is no room for recrimination: though we may interpret the meaning of the Sacraments differently, yet all of us long to see our people devout

communicants ; we all believe that in some way Christ comes to the humble soul in Communion. None of us are content with things as they are.

But we must not stop even here. Conversion and sacramental life do not exhaust the meaning of the wonderful phrase ' in Christ.' Life in Christ issues in a life lived for Christ and like Christ.

We have learnt from the prophets downwards a lesson which was insistently and finally ratified by our Lord Himself, that religion and goodness must always and everywhere go hand in hand.

If men are Christians, they must live *for* Christ. We are to be His servants, His friends, engaged in promoting the objects He has at heart. All causes which are Christ's are ours. Is He anxious that all the world should come to the Father through union with Himself ? If so, then we are all missionaries. All talk of the happy heathen living simple blameless lives of atheism or idolatry is so much futile wind. Christ wants them Christians ; so far as we are concerned He shall have them. Is He anxious that all His children should be pure in heart that they may see God ? If so, we do with our whole heart hate and resist prostitution, impurity, animalism of every kind. We shall listen to no specious pleas that man has an animal side : we know it too well, alas ! in ourselves ; but we know he has a spiritual side as well, to which the animal side must surrender and bow the knee.

Is He anxious that His children should be free

and happy and Godlike ? If so, we are sworn enemies to slums, sweating, dirt, disease, cheating, overreaching, social selfishness, and unbrotherliness of every sort and kind.

All causes and programmes which we discern to be Christ's are therefore ours too : and because we desire to live for Christ, we forward and promote those causes not with languor and half-heartedness, but with a zeal that is simply a passion. And into this noble passion we endeavour to sweep all our people, not contented till every single one is a wholehearted, passionate, eager advocate of those causes which are Christ's, and therefore ours. And, finally, if we are ' in Christ ' we must live *like* Christ. This does not mean that we can all be Galilean carpenters and preachers. Obviously we cannot. But it does mean that we must try to live on the principles by which Christ lived. And these are simple. He loved His Father, and He loved His neighbour ; His heart was full of that tender, sacred, intimacy with the Father which is the atmosphere of the Gospels. He looked at man and loved him. Sometimes He wept over men, sometimes He upbraided them : but always because He loved them. We then who are Christ's must live on the same lines. We must seek, in prayer and general outlook, to know and love our Father intimately, reverently, tenderly, nobly. We must look out on mankind and try to see below the surface into the pathos, the sorrows, the nobility, the tragedy, which underlie every human life. We often do not see them. People sometimes seem to

us horrid or boring : that is because we are so deficient in sympathy and vision. Those who are Christ's must learn to look deep : to understand, to pity, to admire, to pardon, and to love.

I think we can now sum up. Human beings have an end—union with God. This union they will find in Christ. ' In Christ ' implies conversion and sacramental life issuing in a daily life lived for Christ, and on Christ's principles.

We are sure that this programme is true, and that God has revealed it, and that only by fulfilling it will human beings be happy, holy, satisfied, and at rest. Therefore, if we accept our vocation as priests, we give our whole time and interest to forwarding this programme, this gospel. We submit ourselves totally and absolutely to God that we may be fresh and fit for such a noble work. We then plunge into the great tide of human life where, by work and prayer, by persuasion and influence, we endeavour to help the souls of men to God. We try to see to it that our flock, God's people, are helped in every possible way to a true conversion ; to a right understanding and use of the Sacraments ; to a life of Christian prayer and work based on the principles of love of God and of man, and issuing in a gallant and sustained championship of all the causes which Christ has at heart for the welfare and salvation of His creation. And I would emphasise that we are persuaded that this is the road not only of duty but of happiness too. We are not urging our people to take up just a heavy, burdensome, weary load.

Duty fulfilled results in the only true happiness attainable by man. 'The fear of the Lord maketh a merry heart, and giveth joy and gladness and a long life' (Ecclesiasticus i. 13). We are sure that this testimony is true. Partly by sad experience, partly by observation, we have come to know that wicked pleasures, and unmanly idleness, as well as selfishness, make men unhappy. You have only to look at them. Take a good look at a middle-aged sensualist: could anything be more stupid and dull? Look inside the drunkard's home: follow the unloving man around; are these happy? So we, when we give our lives to persuade our folk to follow Jesus Christ, have a double satisfaction. We know that, if they obey Him, they will not only be doing what is right, but will incidentally gain the truest happiness and the deepest peace which is possible for mankind.

CHAPTER III

HOW DOES ONE BECOME A COMPETENT AND PROFESSIONAL PRIEST?

ONE becomes a professional in any science or department of work by getting qualified for the work, and then using the right methods and machinery.

A soldier first gets the soldier's ἦθος, outlook, and training, then he uses the various forces and weapons at his command. In the priest's work one must be converted (or in process of conversion) oneself, and then can use with profit the various priestly functions and influences—pastoral, sacerdotal, missionary.

But first and foremost the priest must be a converted man if he hopes to be the means of converting others. It is hard to warm others unless you are warm yourself. In this chapter then I want to investigate the priest's own life, and in subsequent chapters to deal with the functions which he must discharge and the weapons he must use for his warfare.

THE PRIEST'S OWN CONVERTED LIFE

A converted priest is not converted only for himself, but his conversion is his most powerful weapon.

God often converts people quite apart from any recognisable human agency. Yet most often people are converted by the influence—conscious or unconscious—of those they meet. Hence the necessity of converted priests.

For conversion is catching. It is like scarlet fever or smallpox. An infectious child spreads scarlet fever everywhere: you catch it unintentionally and unawares. So with a converted man or woman; they spread round themselves a subtle atmosphere in which the things of God show up clearer; goodness becomes more natural in their environment; evil more threadbare. If I were asked how to convert a parish, I think I should say, 'Turn a hundred converted people loose in it.' Others would certainly catch the glow, the temper, of conversion. This also, I think, gives the answer to the question which all good priests ask themselves so often: 'How can I convert my people?' The first answer is, 'Be more converted yourself.' It is downright pitiable how often we pile up the machinery—we multiply services, our throats are sore with a succession of 'few words,' yet the parish remains as it was. 'Fresh products fall from our tired hands,' but we get no nearer the only result worth having—our people's growth in spirituality. And what is the explanation? Quite simple. We are not converted enough ourselves, we do not pray enough, we do not stand near enough to God for others to catch the infection of His lingering Presence. Of course there are some people whom nobody, however

good, seems able to help—yet there are always others who are in reality only awaiting their pastor's conversion to catch the infection of it themselves. Therefore a good priest will always be praying for and longing for a deeper and truer conversion, because then he may hope to win his people to God ; like our Lord, he sanctifies himself 'for their sake,' because he perceives that his own converted life is his most potent weapon. He is not self-conscious about it all, yet he knows that if only he can stand near enough to God, others will catch a glimpse, not of himself—he would hate that—but of the Lord he serves.

How then can we get conversion, and what is the routine of a converted priest's life ?

Now sometimes it occurs that conversion simply happens. A person who has not thought about God particularly seriously, if at all, is suddenly overwhelmed by the consciousness of being possessed by God. This is a phenomenon, a fact, a matter testified to by multitudes ; I do not see that it can be gainsaid. It has nothing to do with one's own goodness or efforts : it is simply a gift from God given him to use. A man is reading a book, or saying his conventional prayer ; suddenly things mean something to him in a way he never experienced before. There grows up in his heart—full-blown—a peace, a solemn joy, an intuitively perceived sweet and comfortable relationship with Some One. He could stay like that for ever. Here is peace at last : the jar and fret of things have ceased—this is harmony, this is heaven.

Sometimes this felt conversion lasts a long time. In other people it is short-lived. There is nothing in the world to be compared with it for joy and rapture. Yet it is certainly not given in this form to everybody, and one may well doubt whether certain rather violent efforts to produce it are not dangerous and vulgar. Yet conversion of the deepest and most real kind is at the disposal of all. It is the conversion of the will; and God wants everybody to have it. This sort of conversion starts, I think, with *thinking*. You think deeply about the big things; God, eternity, yourself, what heaven and hell really mean. When you are sufficiently convinced of the truth of God you turn to Him simply and naturally with prayer. You would say something like this, I expect—

'Father, you make me certain offers, of pardon and of help. I need them, for I see that I am not good, and that I need your help. I accept your offers, here and now. For Christ's sake forgive me, for Christ's sake help me. For my part I promise to do my best to correspond.'

Having thus thought or spoken, the man goes his way, and does his best—his human best. For human best must have some margin allowed for weariness and failure. But I call that man converted: at least he is in the saving process of conversion. He is all right; he is certainly accepted. He has much to learn and far to go, as we all have, yet at the moment he is right with God. He has realised his real relationship of dependence upon God; he has

asked for salvation in Christ's Name. God has given it at once. God will lead him farther, through the experiences, struggles, devotions, sacraments, which lie ahead. But he is there all right. He has arrived. He can now work for God.

But conversion is by no means the end of the Christian's life, whether he be layman or priest. It must spread like a dye until it colours the whole range of the life and activities of the converted person. And in the case of the priest we can trace out the course of his personal converted life pretty clearly.

(1) *The priest must be a man of prayer.*—I do not simply mean that he says his offices of Morning and Evening Prayer ; that of course he is bound to do, in obedience to the Book of Common Prayer. I do not simply mean that he says his morning and evening prayers. I mean the sort of priest who through the hard discipline of praying regularly, through times of fervour and times of utter barrenness and sterility, has come to the achievement of being able to step aside from the turmoil and fret of life into silent communion with God. It is a great happiness and strength when one can do that. Amid any circumstances whatever, deep down in your heart you utter the word 'Father,' and instantly you know that the Father is there and is listening, and amid all the ceaseless activity of His creative work pauses to listen to His child. So you keep, as it were, a little shrine in your heart where God condescends to abide always, and you can lift the curtain and go in just whenever you

like; quite sure to find Him Who loves you, Who belongs to you as you do to Him. People wonder what there is in religion; they think it consists of church-goings and sermons and treats and controversies: they little suspect that there are many who, by God's grace, carry within their own hearts the source of all joy and peace and love. Happy the man who has found this secret. While the world frets and worries, he thanks God that, by the easiest process in the world—the simple lifting of the spiritual curtain—he can enter into the House of Rest he carries within him, and there is at home. He can pray there, or he can rest there—he can please himself, for there is no etiquette here; he who knows God knows freedom.

Such a man as this will often pray. You see him pray as he enters church, he does not hurry away after his Communion, he likes to get away and be with God at odd moments, as a lover snatches moments to see his beloved. He is a friend of God, not an acquaintance: he knows what devotion means. I remember once hearing a criticism of a priest. 'He is a good man, but not the sort of chap you see praying all over the place.' There is a truth in this criticism which is worth bringing out. For there are many of us priests who pass muster and no more. Such men may say their prayers pretty regularly, and live a thoroughly decent and worthy life. They are kindly, ordinary, matter-of-fact, pleasant. Yet one feels the lack of the heroic, the spiritual, the Christ-like. One feels that the priesthood demands something more

than a pleasant English gentleman who happens to have been ordained. There ought to be something more strenuous and heroic about it. He ought to be 'stripped for action'; manifestly engaged in warfare; moving among the vital realities of life and death, heroism and self-sacrifice. You instinctively feel that the priest ought to be spiritually on active service, at the front—the sound of firing always in his ears. Yet we all know how easy it is to slip into a peace routine, where we keep things going and avoid any notable scandal. Yet for us priests this is simply a surrender and a betrayal, for there is no truce or peace for us while the world, the flesh, and the devil are laying siege to our people's souls. Yes, the priest must ever be a man of war; once he forgets it and seeks the comfortable, the pleasant, he is a traitor, a deserter. He has betrayed the cause of God. Yet how easy it is to do so! We may have a slack vicar when we begin our ministry; it takes something to survive that. We may begin to purr contentedly over the two hundred communicants who disguise from us the unconverted state of the five thousand eight hundred other people in our parish. We may comfort ourselves with the miserable triumph that our church has a hundred more communicants than the other church across the road. Or again, we may get so very tired; it is hard to spurt for even ten years. And we come to feel that, after all, some of the older clergy are right; it is no good being in a fuss; we shall not set the Thames on fire; we must just do

our job and look after our devout people and leave the rest till a new dispensation of the Spirit occurs. In the meantime (and here is the subtle temptation) let us make life endurable by such means as lie to our hand—little selfishnesses, little slacknesses, little self-indulgences.

Ah, but think of the result. Good-bye visions, good-bye dreams, good-bye the prophetic outlook and the clear sight and the arresting voice. Good-bye romance, good-bye triumph, suffering, effort, nobility; good-bye heroism, saintliness, devotion, conversions. We all settle down: the priest to his little comforts, the people to their conventional religion and to their sins. And why? Because the parish priest does not really pray. Admitted, that it is hard to keep the fire going. Admitted, that it is natural to be weary. Admitted, that people are hard to move. Yet fresh fire is obtainable, fresh strength available, if you only know where to look. It is in prayer, in devotion, in Sacrament, that we draw out from God His stores of daily power and fierce energy. We faint when we cease to pray, and only then. Every day we can renew our strength if we like. How well I remember realising that, long after I was a priest, I fear. I was considering the weight of temptation, the likelihood of weariness and exhaustion, which lies so near a priest. And it came like a sort of flash. 'But there is a way of safety if you care to use it. You can have any strength you like for any task you like. Special temptations can be resisted

from supernatural resources. You can have power to resist evil thoughts, you can have strength to work or preach, *if you like!* Ask the Father for Christ's sake to give you regular help for regular work, and special strength for special work or for special temptations, and He will. He will not fail, He does not fail. If there is failure it is only because you have not leant on Him.' I am sure it is true, every word of it. We get up to preach and are weary and have no message. One simple heartfelt prayer: 'Dearest Father, help me to do my best for Thy sake and their sake,' and five minutes later the mind is clear, the vision open, the heart happy.

Prayer makes all the difference! I wish I could underline that twenty times, for all our sakes. Eucharistic devotion; morning and evening prayers; Mattins and Evensong said; meditation which thinks over some passage or subject with God; contemplation which is intercourse with God without any etiquette whatever; intercessory prayers, ejaculatory prayers; odds and ends of prayer and fellowship with our Friend; a continuous life of happy friendship and right relationship with our Father and Saviour—all these make up the right and inevitable background of the priest who is going to do his job.

So far as you are prayerless, you will fail. If you pray well, you must succeed.[1] It will not be easy.

[1] I have tried to work out the different sorts of prayer in *Prayer and some of its Difficulties* (Mowbray, 1915). I should like to recommend Proctor's *In Ways of Prayer* (Longmans, 1*s*. 6*d*.).

It will certainly mean the postponement of the newspaper and the pipe till your meditation or contemplation is done. It means for us early rising, and proper use of the early morning hours. It means attending seriously and doggedly upon God. It means resistance to that terrible waste of time which mostly results from newspapers and desultory talk after breakfast. Till we have done our religious devotions, we must shut the door to the world. The early morning for prayer, the later morning for study or writing; the early afternoon for exercise, the later for visiting; the evening for parish activities and the visitation of men—this may be a parish routine for five days in the week. But if it is not to be insipid, wearisome, heart-breaking, it must be 'begun, continued, and ended' in prayer. O that some of us had learned this earlier! we should have had less failure and uselessness to deplore. But, thank God, even now it is not too late to start. And if you are beginning your ministry, start at once for God's sake, and your people's.

(2) *The priest must be an honest man.*—If we are to be real men we must be honest. It is easy enough to be blinded to facts by our unsuperintended position, and to imagine we are hardworked when we are not so at all. It is easy to pose as oracles if we have our little clique of admirers, who by glossing our faults and expanding our exiguous virtues do us real harm.

But there are other bigger dishonesties on the horizon. We feel as we put on the clerical costume that somehow we must live up to it; we must pretend

to know everything about religion ; we must play the part of the oracle.

Now let us be honest. We know very little indeed ; nobody knows much. We have, it is true, a tradition to hand on and a revelation to proclaim. We are quite right to say, 'The Church teaches this ; the Bible says that.' And if we put ourselves alongside our people as learners and students in common, we shall do all right. But of ourselves we know very little, and are infinitely below our congregations in experience. We came, most of us, from a public school and a university, where we have been guarded from the realities of life. What do we know at first of life and death, love and marriage, pain and loss, sickness and poverty? We are amateurs of life, but the woman down at No. 10 has been a widow for ten years, yet by infinite patience and self-denial has brought up those four children in cleanliness and respectability. Yet she sits humbly among the other mothers at the Monday meeting and listens to our wisdom ! We should be blacking her boots.

Let us be honest. We go to our first parish knowing nothing, simple beginners and amateurs in life's school. We arrive as learners, not teachers yet. Our dippings into Gibson's 'XXXIX Articles' and our mastery of Daniel's 'Prayer Book,' and even a frightened perusal of Canon Newbolt's 'Priestly Blemishes' (awful thought for us on the threshold !) has not given us much insight into life. Let us not pretend to be oracles, but dare to be ourselves ; men who have been

commissioned to hold a great office, but, being conscious of their own immaturity, intend to look around a bit at first. We mean to keep our eyes open, get to know our people, get to love them, in the hope that some day when our experience has grown we may be able, with sure hand, to help and heal them with our ministry.

In the meantime let us be ourselves. I am sure disaster accompanies an effort to appear unnaturally wise or good. Let us make our mistakes; it does not matter. Let us say we do not know; it is true. Let us keep the blessed power to laugh at ourselves; let us loathe to cover up our deficiencies with ecclesiastical pretensions. Those who are honest, those who know themselves, can afford to be natural. Nor need we be afraid to say we do not know things. We do not. The higher one gets in the religious world the less one will find that people pretend.

Religion comes to ordinary men largely through experience of life; with more intellectual people it is safeguarded mostly by probabilities guaranteed by experience. If we pretend to know everything, people only find us out, and we become a stumbling-block. The certainties of religion are few: let us not add to them unnecessarily. There is a kernel of which we can be increasingly sure; in the meantime the phrase 'I do not know' will be one of the most useful in our vocabulary.

The key to honesty is to keep your eye on God. Act as in His sight, and then you need never pretend.

Directly you begin to worry as to what people are thinking of you, you will get wrong. Never act. In your sermons say straight out what your God-given instinct tells you they need. In your reading of the lessons avoid, as you would prussic acid, that awful nightmare, the artificial clerical voice. Be the honest, frank, merry, hardworking, unpretending child of God, and God Himself and life's experience will teach you the rest in time.

(3) *The priest must be hardworking.*—Yes : eight hours a day, or its equivalent, as a minimum. How dreadful it is to think that if we had a foreman over us, we should certainly do our eight hours' day, but as it is only God Who sees us . . . Yet let us defend ourselves against the critic. It is very hard to be systematic in work, not only for the reason that we are not superintended, but because we are so interrupted. Work goes in bits. After an hour in church at 7.30 you come home to breakfast feeling a little tired. In the middle of breakfast, 'Please will you sign a pension paper?' Just as you settle down to read seriously, 'There's a baby dying unbaptised in Tipthorpe Road.' On your return there is a telegram to say that your sister is passing through London and will arrive at 12.35. She goes at 3.30. You then visit till 5. At 5 there is Evensong, and two workers catch you afterwards and tell you that you must write to the Hospital Sunday Fund and get a convalescent letter for Mrs. Jones, and will you inquire why Bill Smith didn't come to Sunday school last week.

By now it is six, and dark, and the hurrying workers returning to home and tea don't want you and the little formalities your advent brings. So you see old Mrs. A., or Mr. B. who can't avoid you because he has a broken leg. In the evening you may have Lads' Brigade, though if you are wise you will mostly choose the evening for systematic visiting of your men.

Intersperse through this day letters to read, letters to answer, visitors and workers to interview, and I think you will agree as to its extraordinary desultoriness, which strong men can conquer, while weak men succumb. But I am sure that if we are to retain our manhood, we must bring some order out of this chaos. Morning for study; afternoon for visiting; evening for men. I am inclined to think a programme is good. It must include a free day (else we get so stale), and time in the afternoon for exercise, if possible. Personally, if I may go into these vulgar details, I think a heavy lunch is the curse of many men. Instead of exercise, they indulge in sleep during the early afternoon, and wake up to find the afternoon half gone.

But obviously one cannot particularise too much. But this remains true. Unless we do as much work as the ordinary layman—at least eight hours a day or its equivalent—our conscience *ought* to make us despise ourselves, and certainly any honest man will despise us. Thank goodness he demands a high standard. Eight honest, solid, useful hours of work! Do we clergy all do it? Ah, *peccavimus omnes*, or most of us anyway.

(4) *The priest must have common sense.*—A homely virtue, yet indispensable for a priest. The point is, I think, to remember that although we are priests, yet we are still ordinary human beings with an ordinary gentleman's obligations of politeness, patience, and prudence. You may find, just as doctors do, that there are some women who are dangerous people. If so, be extra careful, and avoid anything which may make you look silly or base. Your instinct will tell you at once when to be careful. Or again with boys. Many workers among boys spoil them by making pets of them. A boy who is a pet is a pest. Boys want rough-and-tumble handling; they need the boot sometimes, but never the caress. Clergy who pet boys are fools, and the petted boy becomes a prig and a nuisance. In all our dealings with boys we need to be open-air, healthy, robust. If you ever see a worker among boys sitting with one of these boys on his knee, get rid of him at once. He is producing soft, emasculated material; he is doing harm and not good.

So with other points which seem little, but are big. Never contract debts: your tailor or cab-proprietor rightly discounts your sermons when you let his bill get overdue. So with your appearance. I wish I could impress you with the harm that some clergy do by appearing at Oxford unshaved and unkempt, wearing a coat that recalls the days of good Queen Victoria, and a hat that has doubtless often served as a sleeping-bag for the cat. The undergraduate, sensitive as he is to the appearances and

character of religious people, shrugs his shoulders. 'This is what happens if you take to religion. You get frowsy and dishevelled. What! me be a parson? not much! I might get like that.' And so it is with us all the way through: we are under the searchlight always. Our dress and profession entails obligations which the public insists we shall discharge. If they see us acting selfishly in a railway train, if we make a terrific fuss over our lost luggage while the equally afflicted soldier at our side behaves with quiet dignity, it lowers our profession in the eyes of the bystanders. If we are overbearing or dominating at dinners or functions, and fussy and self-important generally, it gets known. Men dislike us because we do not behave in ordinary matters as ordinary people. Why should they listen to us about matters beyond their ken when we fail so palpably in matters that lie well within their own province? If we can only remember this, and go through our ministerial life with humour and common sense, behaving just like any other ordinary man, without self-consciousness or effort, we shall bring credit, not on ourselves, but on our cloth.

This then is the character of a competent and professional priest. He is a converted man, a man of prayer and work, gifted with honesty and common sense.

I am conscious of two feelings at the end of this long chapter. First, I have not spoken of the happiness and joy which fill up a priest's life when he is at peace with God and is working faithfully.

One has to be a priest to understand it. The joy of being useful, the satisfaction of helping souls, the pleasure of doing good and noble work; what can equal it? At its best the profession of a priest is the noblest and happiest in the world. It is with grateful hearts that we thank God for His vocation to enter it.

And my other feeling is, that all through I have been writing—almost unconsciously—for my friends at Oxford who are thinking of Ordination, and for them have been painting the ideal. When I think of my own actual life, I can only thank God that there is yet time to do better. Yet one can be pardoned for clinging to an ideal and holding it up before others for them to fulfil more worthily; I can only ask those who read what I have written to pardon anything set down too dogmatically or censoriously, and to believe that, whatever the failings of us practitioners may be, we still dream the old dreams and cling to the old visions of a holy priesthood serving a godly people.

CHAPTER IV

THE SORT OF CHARACTERS WE WANT TO PRODUCE

WHAT sort of characters shall we priests try to produce? Saints, you say. Yes, saints; but we must be careful that it is the right sort of saint: some sorts of saints are so disappointing. They ought to be better, and somehow they are not—they seem petty or cowardly or uninspiring.

They abstain from drunkenness and impurity, they are orthodox churchgoers, they may be regular at Communion and at their 'duties,' yet one would not choose them to be in a tight corner with, or as companions in a South Pole expedition. Something is wrong, I think, somewhere. Let us face the question in a blunt, Philistine sort of way. What is a saint? One who is like God. What is God like? Jesus Christ is God, and reveals the Father. A saint, then, is one who is like Jesus Christ. Yet this is difficult, for Jesus Christ combines opposites in a unique way. He has the best characteristics of both man and woman. The strength, the courage, the serenity of a man; the tenderness, the purity, the tenacity of a

woman.[1] Perhaps the best way to become like God is to do what God does, and our actions will react on our characters, making them Christ-like. What then does God do? He works and He loves. He creates and sustains the universes of heaven and earth from the mightiest complex to the most insignificant unit. He loves all His creation with a love that is complete and eternal.

Therefore you must work and love if you would be like God. Ah! but is not this rather illuminating? You cannot be a saint unless you work! unless you have some job you are doing thoroughly, earnestly, whole-heartedly. Digging potatoes will do; ruling a kingdom will do; working for men's bodies will do; labour for men's souls will do. But have you no job? Or is your work done half-heartedly, perfunctorily, unsystematically?

I verily think we clergy are in real danger here. Our next-door neighbour, the postman, is up at 6 A.M. and ends his diurnal tramp at 8.30 P.M. Our nodding-acquaintance, the coal-heaver, does his eight hours' shift of transferring coal from truck to bag or bag to cellar. But we! we are in a really difficult position. Nobody can really superintend us; even in our first curacy the most martinet-like vicar can only control our external activities. Almost alone among professions our pay and position are independent of good and sustained work. The result, I venture

[1] *cf.* the excellent 'Modern Oxford Tract' by Dr. Goudge, entitled *The Moral Perfection of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Longmans, 1s.).

to think, is that the hundred hardest-worked men in England are clergy ; and the hundred vilest slackers are clergy.

But be that all as it may, we shall lay down as the first law for ourselves and our people and all who desire to be saints—Work. Prayer is work, of course, but if we find anybody who is living an aimless life, a life without purpose and effort and sweat, then rule them out of the candidates for sainthood. It is no use that they come to the daily service ; it is no use that they are negatively blameless. Without real work no man or woman is like God.

And so with love. God works and loves. No cold-hearted person can be a saint. The most foul-mouthed rough, living in sin with a woman he cares for, is more like God than the respectable Pharisee who loves nothing or no one. The tiniest spark of love is better than all the world without that.

Therefore look out for saints among men and women who love their husbands and wives, who delight in their homes and children. Search for saints among those who love God and love human life. But among all the dreary mass of aimlessness and unlovingness do not look for saints, for you will not find one.

What we want to train up our boys and girls to be is this—they must be workers and lovers. They must do their jobs honestly, thoroughly, conscientiously ; they must love their mothers and fathers, their wife and children, their brothers and

sisters and ' pals,' whole-heartedly, unselfishly, deeply, and then they will be on the way to Christian saintliness. They will have nothing to unlearn; only something more to learn. For we shall tell them frankly that they have just one more lesson to learn. They must broaden the basis of their love and work. *Work* must include work for God and humanity as well as the daily job. It must include worship, and social efforts, and the building of the New Jerusalem—the Kingdom of Christ on earth. *Love* must include the love of God and of humanity, as well as the love of wife and child. They must learn the truth and tenderness of the Father's heart and the Father's Love and the Saviour's compassion; they must learn to love poor, suffering, comic, tragic, romantic humanity, so that by learning to love, they may perceive how to help.

These will be the real saints: these are the sort of characters we desire to produce. We have no time for precious saints and freak saints. We want to produce workers and lovers, who start from the basis of human work and human love rightly fulfilled, but who broaden out into union with the Divine Love and Work which is found in the Eternal Life of God. Among these true saints will be included priests and laymen, monks and nuns, sailors and soldiers, tinkers and tailors, in fact all true workers and true lovers, but in the outer darkness must always remain those who will not work and those who do not love.

CHAPTER V

THE PRIEST AS PASTOR

You sail then into your new parish ready for action. Unnecessary hamper is overboard, the guns' crews are at their post, the officers are at their stations. In other words, you are prepared to fight for God and for the souls of men. Your preparation consisted first and foremost of your own conversion. You thought things over honestly, you had it out with God, you made your submission to His will, you repented (as far as you could manage it) of your sins, and you put your trust in Him, once and for all, that He will see you through, now and beyond the crack of doom for ever. Imperfect as your conversion still is, yet it will serve. It will deepen with time, but for the present you can do no more. You emerge into your new parish quietly confident. What lies before you, you do not know. Parishes differ ; people differ ; you cannot use all the methods of Whitechapel in Oxford or of Oxford in Whitechapel. But, wherever you are, from Archangel to Antipodes, you must be their pastor and their priest. Who is the true pastor ? One who knows his sheep, and knowing them loves them. He loves them in the

mass and loves them in the individual unit. Some people think it difficult to love a crowd; I remember a remark of a well-known essayist to that effect. On the contrary, I think nothing easier. You want a little imagination and a little common humanity, and the thing is done. You stand, for instance, in a pulpit and survey the crowd beneath you. Every one, beneath that ordinary exterior, carries their own little world of joy and aspiration, of pain and disappointment. There is the business man anxious and worried as to whether he can keep his wife and children in comfort. There is the young man trying to keep his conscience unstained, though hard put to it by reason of fierce temptation. There is the widow trying to be brave, though her sun has set as far as this world is concerned. There is the girl who has just found out the wonder and dreamy rapture of a first love. There they are, all alive, all human, all pilgrims on the great high road: all standing near the great tragedies of death or disaster, all filled with their various longings and aspirations, some of which will come to fruit while some will wither untimely, blasted by the breath of misfortune or ill-fate. So regarded, are they not all pathetic, all lovable, all to be helped, encouraged, strengthened, saved? Are we not tugs sent out to bring them safe out of the cruel heaving ocean of life into the Harbour of God? Are we not shepherds sent to collect them from the stony wilderness, and to bestow them safely into the keeping of the chief Shepherd of souls? Of course we are,

and of course we love them, our own human, wandering, struggling, lovable sheep.

Yet I freely admit you will not love them at once. At first you will only know them on the surface, you will not have penetrated to their essential selves. That is why you must give yourself time; that is the *raison d'être* of visiting. For we must know people before we love them. Love follows knowledge; does not precede it.

Therefore I should say that your methods for learning to be a good pastor would be these—

(1) *Mix with your people: visit them.*—It is said of King David that the people loved him because he went in and out among them. Perfectly true of all true pastors. They must know their people, and their people them. If you sit in church till your people come to you, you are a heartless inefficient, and they will never come. Forgive the strong expression, but that sort of attitude maddens me. It is so grossly inhuman, so opposed to the temper of the Incarnation, wherein God did not sit in Heaven waiting for us to climb to Him, but came Himself among us, that by His humility and affection He might win us. Do not trust a priest who does not visit. He is sure to be full of moans about the hopeless state of the Church of England and of religion generally, but he has not earned the right to grumble, for he has not done his duty.

Do not accept a curacy with a vicar who does not believe in visiting. He is no good; only another

excrescence on the face of the Church. He may be full up with committees and meetings, he may be a fluent speaker, but he is no good, no real labourer. Of course there are difficulties. No one likes to have doors shut in his face (as sometimes happens), and first visits as a rule are trying, but if you persevere, you will see for yourself how necessary and right is this spade-work. Do not, I beseech you, accept any excuse for not visiting. There is no excuse: so resolve to be a visitor.

Perhaps you will forgive me if I give you one or two hints about visiting. *Don't overdo it.* It is extraordinarily exacting work, and our vitality ebbs under it. If you visit new people for two hours a day for four days in the week you have done well. That is of course additional to your visitation of sick or special people. If you try much more than this you will feel like the Israelites felt towards the manna—that you loathe it all. I know some vicars try to make their curates do four hours' visiting a day: you should avoid those parishes unless you are a spiritual Hercules. And you would only get wooden if you tried to do so much: we must keep our spring.

(2) *Pray before you start.*—For if we believe in prayer we shall believe that, as a result, God will open ways to us hitherto closed. Besides, it puts us in the right mood and temper for the work.

(3) *You must judge at the time whether to pray with them or not.*—Some of us have fretted ourselves

to death over this difficulty. We feel unnatural if we do, and cowardly if we do not. I am inclined to think we should always pray with the sick, or with a bereaved or sorrowful person. Otherwise, not at the first visit or two. God gives us liberty to judge, I think, whether it is advisable or not. But it is wonderful what can be done quite naturally as we get to know our people better. They tell us their needs and troubles when they know us, and forthwith prayer with them becomes perfectly natural and wholesome. The truth is, we shrink from the man who discusses the weather and politics, and then suddenly says 'Let us pray.' You feel it is artificial and unreal. On the other hand, the man who visits a house again and again without ever a prayer is no true pastor. (This, by the way, is as true of the West End as the East End; the rich suffer horribly from our unpastoral cowardice.) So we must judge at the moment, allowing for our natural cowardice, yet refusing to be unreal or uncomfortable. I think that you will find that you pray with your people seldom at first, but increasingly with every year of your ministry.

Visiting, then, will be the fundamental spade-work duty of a true pastor. Next in importance comes the great pastoral function of preaching.

Preaching.—I underline the word because of its nobility, its effectiveness, its glory.

I asked you to beware of clergy who decried visiting: beware also of those who decry preaching.

For though bad and slovenly preaching is one of the worst of poor humanity's burdens, and one of the devil's best friends, yet godly preaching is the principal means of saving souls on a large scale.[1] Let us consider preaching very carefully.

Note first that the root of all real preaching is in the heart of the preacher. You cannot preach what you do not believe or do not feel. If religion does not make you happy yourself, you are useless at recommending it to other people. So the first qualification for a preacher is that he is a converted man. Without this, the whole thing is what sailors call 'a wash-out.' How I fear and suspect training for preaching! I believe nearly the whole training for it can be put into one sentence: 'Be converted and continue to study, and see to it that all your sermons have a beginning, middle, and end, in order that it may be clear to the hearers.' You see, a converted man has his heart full of matter. He knows, for instance, and rejoices to know, that God is Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Love. He likewise knows that this great and Holy God is his own familiar Friend. He knows that Christ has saved him. He sees that evil is futile, disappointing, treacherous: but that true goodness brings peace and joy. He knows that, in Christ, he has found the key to all that is lovely and romantic and eternally valuable. He sings songs of deliverance, he almost trembles with joy at the wonder and splendour of his alliance with God. Now the heart

[1] *cf.* Phillips Brooks's *Lectures on Preaching.*

of that man is full of matter. He simply longs to tell his secret that others may share it. By all sorts of methods and means he tries to tell what the Love of God is, how others can get it, how others can share his joy. He will try and deliver his soul by all sorts of means. Sometimes through the interpretation of a text, sometimes through a commentary on some public matter, sometimes through some lesson from the life of a saint. But always he is striving to do the same thing, to communicate that inexpressible thing—the wonder and joy and love which God has given him. You see how his sermons are born. They are parts of his own experiences thrown at you: they are bits of his own joy which he offers you: they flow naturally and generously from the ever-springing watershed of conversion in his own heart.

Conversion, then, is the real source of all powerful preaching. But we have to learn to use the weapon with the greatest possible skill. This means that we ought to have a searching insight into the hearts of our people so as to know their standpoint, their needs, their tenderest points. For instance, I am sure that in dealing with sailors their family affections are the avenue through which you will reach them best. This again illustrates the value of visiting: you get to know the point of view of your people, and thus in your sermons can deal with them with real insight, since you know where they need correcting, encouraging, or altering. It is little use shooting sermons into the dark. And one must further allow for the

modern mind. The old days of pulpit eloquence, of long sermons with purple patches and florid descriptions of Swiss scenery, are gone. Men to-day want something less flowery, more direct, more workmanlike. They want something which is going to help them to lead a supernatural life in face of the very concrete difficulties and temptations among which they live. They crave for a high and noble ideal, but it must be practical too. So I think we must aim at being very direct. We must feel that there is something real and pressing that God wants to say to them, or something which they obviously need to know. Then we say it in the simplest language at our command, and present it (here comes the sermon-making ; the sermon is born of our conversion) in such arrangement as makes it clearest to our audience. For instance, suppose we see that our people are too emotional in their religion, we shall badly want to tell them that the basal relationship to God consists of duty done as well as love felt. That is the middle of your sermon. But it wants leading up to, and a conclusion drawn from it. So you need a beginning and a finish. There are fifty beginnings you might make. A general statement, perhaps, of the two types of attitude towards God—the Catholic idea of love, and the best Protestant idea of duty, or something of that sort. That is point number one. Then comes your message : ' Real religion is a combination of the two. It starts with duty and expands into love.' This is where you will put your weight and force, on

the single central truth your sermon is designed to teach. Finally you reach your corollary, the practical result which your sermon is meant to achieve. You ask whether they have not been thinking that religion means religious feeling, instead of being based on work truly done and duty sincerely performed. And you urge them to look into their own departments of life and judge whether they can pass God's test of duty done. That is arrangement. And that is a matter of time and thought. Yet it must be simple. You ought to be able to get up in the pulpit with your plan so uncomplicated that you could write the three main points of your sermon in three headlines, *e.g.*—

(1) Contrast Catholic and Protestant ideas of religion.

(2) Say that true religion combines the two.

(3) Urge them to strengthen up the line of duty first.

If your sermon is more complicated in main arrangement than this, you will be trying to remember —and you will never preach effectively while you are trying to remember—what you ought to say next. (Of course there are preachers and occasions and congregations which are best suited by written sermons. I am assuming that you desire to be able to preach effectively and convertedly from notes and headings which you glance at seldom, if ever.)

A very good way is to preach your sermon beforehand to God, in its three main heads. You kneel down and say, 'Father, I am going to try and teach

your children this. That men have often dissociated the twin ideas of duty and love ' (or whatever your sermon is about). ' I am going to tell them that they *must* hold the two ideas together. I am going to ask them all to examine their lives and business and judge whether they are ruled primarily by duty, or whether they have been thinking that they can be slack or dishonest or unjust, and yet call themselves religious.' Very often, as we are telling God what we are going to tell His people, we discover that our matter is ill-arranged, that the conclusion does not follow from the premisses, and so on. In that case we alter it till it does. Other times we are conscious as we unfold our sermon to God of its inadequacy or over-hastiness of thought and care and preparation. Then we try to improve.

But I am sure that the source and preparation of a real sermon is thus. It springs from a pastor's heart almost automatically, as a result of his love of God and of his people. His arrangement is simply for the sake of clearness. When you listen to an ineffective stream of platitude, you may be sure there is something loose somewhere. Perhaps the preacher has been slack in his prayers or visiting. Then he will say that dangerous thing, ' What on earth am I to preach about next Sunday ? ' as if the true pastor had not a hundred things to say and it is only a question how he can get them all in. Or the preacher has not grasped the necessity of arrangement—the grouping of everything round one single luminous point of

exhortation or exposition. But you—if you have ambition to serve God and your people by preaching—keep your eye on these two points. First, keep your own conversion bright by prayer, and then take the trouble to make your arrangement both simple and clear.

I hope it is plain that I have been talking about preaching, not teaching. The lines of demarcation between the two are probably not absolutely clear, since teaching of the head can sometimes communicate a glow to the heart. Nevertheless, there is a great distinction. Preaching is truth conveyed through personality, and it aims at conversion of the heart and will. It is emotional and passionate. Teaching is cooler; it aims at the head and the intellect. A perfectly converted Christian might be ignorant to a degree, but even he needs a minimum of teaching. But a well-instructed converted Christian is far better, and teaching has its full place in the Christian life. However, of teaching—since it may be regarded as largely a priestly function ('The priest's lips should keep knowledge')—I will endeavour to treat in the next chapter, but there are other points about preaching worth noticing.

(1) *Two distinct aims in preaching.*—You may preach for conversion or you may preach for edification. In the ordinary parish church it is common to keep conversion for the evening and the other for the morning, but you can lay down no exact rule.

How does one preach conversion? Ah, that is

what we all want to know. How to make a man fall in love with God; how to fill his heart with that sense of power and joy and elation which makes religion not only a duty but the supreme happiness. One longs for this with all one's people; but you cannot tell when or how it will come. It may come suddenly, like a sudden rushing wind; it may come gradually, like an increasingly insistent still small voice; it may come volcanically, like an earthquake; it may come almost imperceptibly, like a flowing tide. O that we could produce it at will! as if we could turn a handle and the thing was done. But such is not the way of the Spirit. You cannot produce it at will; there are no tricks in this trade. All you can do is to be converted yourself, at least in will and desire, and go on talking lovingly about God until you produce the sort of atmosphere in which the Spirit can work. For conversion is of God alone. He must act, yet you can produce the sort of atmosphere in which His work can be best done. Some day with your people 'a bolt will be shot back somewhere in their breast,' and they will see things they never saw before, understand things which were previously all haze and twilight, enter into the loving shadow of Divine wings which they never knew were spread over them all the while.

So we must just go on talking, urging, persuading, testifying, until the temperature is right, and then the Spirit will work, and our work is done. Never be discouraged, never despair of your people; take

courage and keep a good heart, and persevere till your life's day is done.

(2) *The other aim of preaching is edification.*—You seek to build up the converted heart till it reaches its highest powers and spreads its wings to the fullest. For your converted man is only a beginner ; his eyes are open ; there is still a long way to go.

His conscience needs expansion, his life purification, his devotional life creation and development. Such a man may know nothing about the Sacraments or the Church ; he may be very ignorant of the Bible ; he may be a novice about prayer, worship, and meditation. So you must do this higher level work for him.

Take devotion alone. What is it ? It starts in conversion, of course. It implies recognition of the fact of the basal filial relationship between God and oneself, and involves that willing acceptance and appropriation of that relationship which is conversion. But this conversion has got to tinge the whole life. Like an oncoming tide, it must fill every creek and recess, and overtop every rock and shoal in the shore of the man's self. It must be manifested in his whole life, not on certain occasions, or in certain ways only. It must colour the whole of his outlook. He must put on, as it were, the coloured spectacles of conversion, whereby the whole visible world changes colour. He must henceforth look at life not as a man only but as a Christian. And this universal change of outlook must percolate down into all sorts

of habits and acts. He must learn the whole science and range of prayer. He must learn what worship means, especially in its supreme expression as Eucharistic worship. He must learn to read his Bible and pray over it. He must learn to include all mankind in his sympathies as part of his devotion to God. He must learn to look for and find Christ in his Communions. He must go deep into repentance and get down to the bed-rock of utter humility and utter surrender. What a task is here for the pastor! What varieties of sermons he must preach! Sometimes he will warn, other times he will encourage—for the tired men and women workers of to-day need encouragement more than anything else. Remember that, and *never* scold.

Again, he will hold up the high vision and illuminate the heights and joys of religion. Sometimes he will explain things—texts, doctrines, sacraments, creeds, religious customs, and names. On other occasions he will persuade, taking for granted the great Christian verities, and pleading with his dear people to come in deeper and be more at rest.

All this is concerned with edification, which with conversion forms the complete aim of the true pastor.

(3) *He may use two different sorts of sermon.*—All this preaching taken seriously is very tiring. Therefore it is legitimate to preach in the mode of a familiar talk as well as of a set and carefully prepared sermon. Both sorts are legitimate, as long as you do not confuse the two. The familiar talk is frankly unprepared, or

little prepared, and is a sort of spoonful of the preacher's ordinary thoughts and feelings about the subject, *e.g.* 'I am going to talk to you for five minutes about St. Matthew, whose festival we are keeping to-night. I do not intend to try and go deep, but just speak of the lessons which lie on the surface. Here is an ordinary business man suddenly called away to live the life of a wandering preacher. What does it mean for us? It does not mean that everybody must leave his ordinary work, but it *may* mean so for some of us, while for everybody it does mean that in all our life, work, and habits, the claim of Christ to our loyalty must come first. . . .' I do not think anybody could be insulted by that surface analysis and obvious lesson. You cannot profitably preach an exhausting sermon more than twice in a week. Do your utmost and best then: but if you have to preach five times in a week, it is better to preach two real sermons and give three familiar talks, than to attempt five great efforts which will only end in pomposity and unreality. After all, what wise writer attempts five short stories in one week? We are wiser to attempt less and do it well.

And as my last word I do beg you to take preaching seriously. Remember the innumerable lessons and warnings and encouragements of God which are set down in Scripture for you to draw out and proclaim to your people. Here alone is an exhaustible supply of real sermons. Remember the ceaseless current of God's life which runs through your own heart if you

are converted, and give your people drink from this well. Remember that if you really love your people and want to help them you will never really fail. Remember that it is worth while taking trouble over your sermons. Do not be content with unrelated discourses which flare like a rocket and then are over. Take the trouble sometimes to preach courses of sermons which deal at adequate length with the tremendous subject you have to present. Deal with separate subjects sometimes, but take care to give your people, from time to time, a bird's-eye view of the whole Christian scheme of redemption. Do not be afraid to tread again and again the steps of the great ladder which leads men to God—thinking, praying, loving, repenting, finding union, paying loyal service [1]—that ladder which must be ascended step by step in exact order, or else the soul will never arrive at God.

Some people deprecate preaching: they fear lest it should overshadow Sacraments. Do not give in to this fear: the Word and the Sacraments go hand in hand. And be sure that preaching—convertedly and faithfully used—is the greatest and grandest means open to a man to bring the souls of his flock to the feet of their God.

I hope that it may not be necessary to deal at length with all the rest of the relationships between a pastor and his flock. Once grasp that your privilege

[1] I have drawn this out also in *Prayer and some of its Difficulties* (Mowbray, 1915).

is to love your people, and much else will not need saying. Your love of them will teach you not only to preach to them faithfully and visit them regularly, but will teach you the thousand-and-one little courtesies and considerations which mark a true lover of souls. You will be tender and human with them, exercising a great patience and a wide charity; you will treat them as persons, never as cases (loathsome word), and you will be repaid a hundredfold by their confidence and affectionate response. Naturally you will pray for them too, but surely I need not emphasise that.

But there is one very real additional point I should like to press before I end this chapter.

The church of the true pastor is God's House and the people's home.—Yet how often it conveys 'the subtle atmosphere of a museum.'

There are many churches which are dead. You know it when you get the door opened. There is a sort of smell of spiritual death. A weary old woman who looks at you resentfully, dusts drearily. Nobody is praying, and you cannot see why they should. It isn't a home. How can I explain the subtle difference? Seriously I believe that prayer is an influence that lingers in the places of prayer. If a church has a converted priest and a praying people the atmosphere of the whole place is prayerful. The very walls sweat prayer. That is where your little band of saints comes in. They infect the church with the spirit of prayer. But the aspect of the church helps too. A church should be open; obviously used; homely; free—with corners

where people can pray. Very often pictures make it homelike. And there should be a sort of general expectation that people would come in and pray at any time. But unhappily our churches often resemble only a dreary wilderness tenanted by a cross old verger, whose one object is to get you out so that he may go to his tea. And then people are often so rude and careless in church. They talk or whisper near some kneeling person whose one object is to get a few minutes' complete silence. Sometimes I think we clergy and workers are the very worst offenders of all. I think the Roman Catholics—in England, at all events—must manage these things better. I remember when I was a boy wandering into the Brompton Oratory and kneeling to pray: some giggling tourists took up a position near me and made comments on the appearance of the church. Up came a verger directly, and I heard him whisper, 'Please do not interrupt the gentleman in his meditation.' At that time I had never even heard of meditation, but I felt at once grateful and impressed. I was expected to pray there: provision was made for me as a welcome guest. Excellent verger, I would that you would bite most of the vergers in the Church of England and communicate your pastoral courtesy.

I do hope I am not exaggerating, but some churches are nightmares of chilling repression. They may be homes of truth; they certainly are not homes of love. If you ever have control of a church, take up this matter vigorously. Resist the verger, and offer him

the alternative of reverence or dismissal (better still, convert him). Insist on quiet reverence at all times in the building. Provide desks and books and a few crucifixes and any other means, great or small, which aid to devotion. Make the church a real home of prayer, where the weary, the tempted, the struggling may enter and find rest.

So it is with the services. You have to convert some and edify some. You have to save souls, and to worship and glorify God. Obviously Dolling was right here. You need grand uplifting services to lift men out of the dreary, work-a-day world into the presence of God, and you require homely, simple services in which to pray with your people, and talk to them about God and salvation. Roughly then, the two types of services which matter are the Eucharist and the prayer-meeting. For in the former, rightly understood, God is adequately worshipped by our presentation to Him of the unique and representative sacrifice of the Cross; and in the prayer-meeting souls are saved by the ministry of preaching and praying.

So your church will be one where the Holy Sacrifice is regarded as the supreme service of the worship of God, and the prayer-meeting is an indispensable means of conversion. But—all homely, please, and unconventional in the right sense. O some of you churchwardens, some of you sidesmen, some of us clergy! I have seen a workman get up and leave the church, which he had at last ventured to enter, because

an official said to him, 'Here, you can't sit there; that seat is engaged,' or words to that effect.

I have seen people allowed in, instead of quietly welcomed in. O officialdom: how cursed is your influence upon churches! will you never be content to serve, to wait upon the children of God? Will you never learn to love and to be humble?

Rectors, vicars, priests, pastors,—see to it that your churches are houses of God and homes for your people.

Note on prayer-meetings.—There are several sorts of prayer-meetings, and all good.

(*a*) The most ordinary is where the pastor stands in the middle of the people and speaks briefly as to the object of this particular meeting, adding perhaps some remarks on the duty and efficacy of prayer.

He then gives a subject. 'Let us pray for the conversion of the world'; 'Let us pray for missions in India'; 'Let us pray for our sailors and soldiers,' or whatever it may be.

Then a pause of two minutes, and then he 'collects' the intention of all present into a collect—probably some form of extempore prayer.

(*b*) A meeting of people who pray in turn as the Spirit moves them. The only danger here is of showing off our facility of prayer; this, however, must be risked.

(*c*) The 'Quaker' prayer of silence.

You meet at a given hour: some particular subject is appointed, *e.g.* 'The Success of this Mission.' For half an hour a complete silence is maintained, during

which all direct their wills and intentions to God for this object.

At the end the blessing might perhaps be given.

The power and happiness of this kind of prayer is said to be as striking as its general disuse is lamentable.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRIEST AS PRIEST

To the pastor belong preaching and the prayer-meeting. Anyone has a right to deal in these, although a member of the church would naturally desire to have the sanction and blessing of the body to which he belongs. But you do not need a priest for these things. St. Francis of Assisi, the supreme preacher and missioner, was not a priest. I think that the clergy would often do well to entrust these functions much more often to the laity. I have seen a church-full of people in the Tyrol engaged in prayer and saying a long litany; there was no priest present, and the leader was an old woman kneeling in her place among the rest. We have a sort of bugbear that you must have a priest present to make a prayer-meeting in church complete. It is surely not so. We could use our laity much more freely for these devotions if only we were less stiff and conventional. But there are certain functions which *are* peculiar to the priest. All Christians are in a real sense priests, because they share the priesthood of Christ, but all are not ministerial priests, commissioned by the body to administer to the members. I do not think we need be called

sacerdotalists in the prejudiced sense of the word because we think that the body—the Church—is guided by the Holy Spirit to commission certain officers to fulfil certain functions for the good of all. The priest is not a person who stands between God and the soul in the sense that he can refuse the soul any benefits to which that soul is entitled. If any priest were to do such a thing, God would make it up to the soul in some other way.

Yet you must have officers, ministers, if you do not want chaos; it is not unreasonable to suppose that it was the Spirit Himself Who directed and guided the Church in her choice and method of choosing her ministers. Admittedly there is a certain obscurity over the precise form of the ministry in sub-apostolic times (say from A.D. 70 to A.D. 110), but out of that obscurity emerges the historic ministry of the Church with a definiteness both clear and strikingly universal. There are some obscurities connected with the ministry of 'prophets,' and there are certain possibilities (not more) that some of these 'prophetic' men may have celebrated the Holy Communion without the formal commission of the Church, or without what we mean by 'episcopal' laying-on of hands. To most of us in the Church of England these early obscurities are of little weight against the preponderating evidence for a regular commissioned ministry, and for the survival and dominance of a ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons ever since.[1]

[1] The whole evidence is given in full in Dr. Darwell Stone's pamphlet entitled *Episcopacy and Valid Orders in the Primitive Church* (Longmans, 1s.).

What, then, is a priest? He is one whose motive and object is to be a reconciler of man to God. He longs to convert and unite human souls to God. But besides this, he has an official position given him by the Church—through the laying-on of hands by the heads of the Church—to administer to the members of the Church certain benefits and blessings from God.

He is the official teacher of the Church's tradition and doctrine: he is the officer who presides and ministers in the Holy Communion: he is the officer entrusted with the official declaration of God's pardon to the penitent sinner.

If Christianity were only an idea, if Christians were unorganised unrelated individuals, if Christianity, in short, were anarchic, there would be no officials, no priests. But if you remember that the Church has always been regarded by its members as corporate, as a body, whose members were units in a great whole, then the ideas of sub-ordination, of a ministry, of a priesthood officially commissioned to administer the things of God to the rest, become natural and inevitable. What society is there in the world which has not got officers? What wonder is it that, since the Church was bound to have officers, we see in the normal Christian ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons an institution which is according to the mind of Christ.

What, then, are the functions of the priest? What is he commissioned by the Church (and so by God

the Spirit) to do and to administer? What functions must he, and he alone, perform?

He is commissioned to do three things. To teach the official creed and faith of the Church; to offer the Christian sacrifice of the Eucharist; to administer the Sacraments of the Gospel. Let us consider these essential priestly functions in detail.

(1) *He must teach the official Christian religion.*—The preacher can persuade, exhort, testify; but the bishop is the guardian of the orthodox faith and tradition of the Church. He authorises his priests and deacons to teach the traditional Catholic Faith of the Church. This traditional Faith is embodied in the Bible and in the Creeds which summarise and underline essential Bible teaching. Beyond these sources and limits of the Faith lies a 'pomerium,' an outer circle, of beliefs, traditions, interpretations, customs, which no genuine and devout churchman would lightly dismiss or neglect: but there is a real distinction—the inner circle of Truth belongs to salvation, the outer circle to edification.

Invocation of saints, keeping of saints' days, fasting Communion, and many another doctrine and practice, in themselves edifying, and by Church consent sanctified, belong to this outer ring of the Faith. I cannot imagine any sane and devout churchman slighting them. Writing as I am on board a battleship where mere customs of comparatively small antiquity (*e.g.* saluting the quarter-deck) are treated as laws of the Medes and Persians—and

rightly so—I cannot see why it is clever or devout or in any way laudable to ignore or neglect the venerable customs and traditions of the great Christian Church. Personally, nothing would induce me to do so. I salute the quarter-deck regularly, and it reminds me of a crucifix once fixed at that spot in the ship—which is, I am told, the origin of the custom.[1] But if the custom had a much less respectable origin, I should still salute. It is the custom of the British Navy; it is good enough for me. If I refused to do so on the ground that I did not see the good of it, I should be regarded here as an offensive imbecile. On much better grounds I respect and practise the ancient doctrines and practices of the Church which belong to the Outer Ring. But nothing is gained by saying that these belong to the Inner Ring of the Faith. Of course, if one accepts that the Church can add to the deposit of faith so as to make necessary for salvation what was not so 1500 years ago, I suppose one would become a Roman Catholic, though if I understand the true Roman position they do not claim more than to expand truths held in germ from the beginning. Anyhow, the Church of England—and here I humbly hold she is entirely right—refuses to add to—nay, refuses the possibility of adding to—the Inner Ring of 'truth necessary to salvation,' and finds that the Holy Scriptures are the quarry from which such essential truth must exclusively be digged.

[1] *cf. Naval Occasions*—a fascinating little book.

Unless you can palpably, honestly, obviously, prove that a truth has scriptural foundation or approval, it is not 'of salvation.' We honour and practise other truths, but we do not confuse them with the bed-rock truths.

What, then, are the Inner Ring truths which the priest is commissioned to teach as representing the Body, the Church? They are the great Christian truths about God and man; man's need, and God's salvation through Christ. They include right teaching about God (so important and so neglected—wrong ideas about God are most prevalent); honest teaching about the fact and meaning of sin; God's redemption of the world through the Incarnation, Atonement, and present Grace of Christ; the Holy Spirit, and His work through conversion and sacrament; the Church as the Holy Society, the Body of Christ; the need of a changed life as the result of conversion and grace—all these are of salvation: all can be proved to be agreeable to the Scriptures:[1] all these are the essential tradition of the whole Church. All these are the content, the material about which we must ponder during the first stage of our pilgrim's progress to God, although we do well to come back to them again and again for deepening and growth.

These will constitute the bird's-eye view of the whole Christian battlefield of Faith. It is really futile to go on niggling away at one point or two points

[1] These are worked out in detail as parts of a specimen Mission Course on pp. 111-143.

on which you happen to be keen (I knew a man who had only two sermons, 'Charity' and 'Damnation': we got them alternate times!), or pegging away at merely subordinate points. We want to give our people glimpses of what you might call the great natural features of the landscape of the Christian Faith: to show them the great mountain ranges and the deep river-valleys and the long stretches of smiling country-side. Once they know the map of religion you can concentrate on this feature or that, and descend even to the minutiae: but if you are not careful to preach the Faith as a whole, so that even while you are teaching some particular thing they yet are conscious of the Whole in the background, you will make them local and suburban Christians, narrow in their outlook, provincial in their sympathies, with a religious crop full of religious morsels unrelated, disproportionate, and therefore undigested. I do not say that a man cannot be saved who possesses the barest minimum of knowledge, nor again is the theologian saved by a plethora of knowledge; yet there must be some essential knowledge of a Saviour who died and lives, of a God who loves and is Holy, of a soul which must choose the right and reject the wrong. Yet edification is part of the Christian life as well as conversion. Therefore the priest's duty is not merely to teach the minimum necessary for salvation, but—as far as he is able—the whole system of truth which the Bible and the Creeds contain. Thus a teacher is different from

a preacher. The preacher's main aim is to convert: the teacher converts incidentally, but aims mainly at edification, at building up an intellectual soundness, sanity, and wholesomeness of the religious mind. A converted Christian might well be a terrible fanatic; the priest by his teaching of the Church's intellectual, moral, and spiritual message would produce the steady, balanced, high-level Christian.[1] That is why we priests must never cease reading and studying. When we do, our teaching fountain dries up, and we become parrot-like utterers of truths which have become stale and unilluminating even to ourselves.

(2) *The priest must offer the commemorative sacrifice of the altar.*—He must lead his people in the true and adequate worship of God. And here, unhappily, we reach real controversial ground: good people differ here. I wonder whether it is possible to explain what is in our hearts when we come to the altar to celebrate the Holy Mysteries? For there must be a fair and full explanation if we are to convince: and one may take as a principle that when one finds so much antagonism to the idea of a Christian sacrifice, and such a hatred of the term 'Mass,' there must be not only some reason but probably some good reason. One must try to realise this. If you meet with a blunt, dogged opposition to what is, to you, a truth as clear as daylight, it *may* be sheer

[1] I have worked out this essential message of the Christian teacher much more fully in *The Life in Grace* (Longmans, 2*s.* 6*d.*), which has separate chapters on God; Sin; Redemption, etc.

prejudice, but it may be the result of some instinct which has much truth in it.

I believe the opposition to the idea of any sacrifice or sacrificial meaning in the Mass (as I will call it for convenience' sake, as the most common word in Christendom to describe the service) lies in the fear that we present something not ourselves, something apart from our own hearts' submission and worship. Now the whole truth and force of evangelical teaching lies in the heart's submission to the Saviour. Hence the idea that we can present a sacrifice to God terrifies evangelicals, lest the offering should exclude the heart's own true oblation and offering of itself. And is this altogether a vain fear? We—thinking of some devout continental Mass at Ober-Ammergau, or the hushed devotion at our own little shrines in the early mornings—indignantly deny danger and assert the beauty and holiness of it all. Yet was there no danger in the past? Did not Italian nobles attend Mass together in the same church, and at their very exit did not a bloody fray arise? Was not Henry VIII as assiduous at Mass as at his lusts? Evangelicals fear lest we offer something instead of ourselves, and it is a real fear. If we offer Christ at our altars, we must offer ourselves in Him: otherwise it is a vain oblation. Let us admit the danger and confess failures in the past, yes, and in the present.

Yet, in spite of admitted dangers, why is the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist so vital to us, so full of the highest devotion and affection?

It is because we love God (or mean to, or try to), and we want to worship Him in the highest possible way. We desire to offer ourselves to Him in sacrifice and obedience. Yet how little and how worthless is the sacrifice we offer—ourselves, so unstable, so selfish, so unworthy!

Is there no sacrifice worthy of God? We know that bullocks and goats were at most symbols and now are vain; we know ourselves unfit, blemished, spotted; is there nothing we can offer Him worthy of Himself?

Yes: there is a sacrifice worthy of His acceptance. It is the sacrifice of Calvary, the sacrifice of Jesus, which He made there for us, as our Representative, as Representative Man. In the supreme act of obedience and self-sacrifice which we call the sacrifice of Calvary, mankind was truly represented (Jesus was incarnate that He might be our own Blood-Brother, our true Representative), and God was adequately worshipped. How difficult it is to express it! Can you imagine men trying blindly and inadequately to worship God? Mankind has always tried to do that. All the blind sacrifices of the heathen, all the typical Jewish sacrifices were just instances of man seeking more or less blindly to offer to God that homage of love, and repentance, and right relationship which the heart of mankind feels instinctively to be due to Him the Holy, Him the world's True Lover.

But all these efforts died down, they were in vain; they are blind tragedy unless regarded in their true light as the prologue to the great Act whereby Humanity

summed itself up in The Man, and in The Man offered itself once and for all in a supreme act of obedience and worship and love.

All before That Act was prologue, all after That Act is epilogue. Calvary is unique. Never can it be repeated, added to, taken from, or altered. Yet we can share it, we can take part in it, we can make it our own, inasmuch as we are part of that Humanity which Jesus assumed. He truly represented us there, and we can respond to Him by taking over and making our own such share of the sacrifice which He offered for us as is possible.

Why do we think thus? Because Jesus before His departure took Bread and Wine and bade us do this 'in remembrance of Me.' The Church has instinctively seen in this touching service more than a receiving into one's soul of the Risen Humanity made available for us under the concrete and easily procurable forms and veils of bread and wine.

The Church has discerned, in addition, a remembrance and commemoration of the Body broken and the Blood poured out by the world's Redeemer and supreme Worshipper. And the Church has also instinctively realised that this 'remembrance' is not only before man but before God. 'We here present, we here spread forth to Thee, that only offering perfect in Thine eyes, the one, true, pure, immortal, sacrifice.'[1]

So when priest and worshipper approach the altar some such thoughts as these are in their mind.

[1] Dr. Bright, *Hymns A. & M.* 322 (267 in 1904 edition).

'Father, we approach Thee to worship and offer the homage of right relationship. But in ourselves we are altogether unworthy. Yet we have a sacrifice worthy of Thy holiness; and it is not a sacrifice with which we have nothing to do. It is our sacrifice because offered by our Blood-Brother. It is our sacrifice because offered by our Representative. Therefore we take this concrete occasion—this memorial service, wherein we offer Thee the Bread and Wine which truly and mystically become the true spiritual humanity of Thy Risen Son—and make it the occasion when we offer Thee His sacrifice, and make it our own. We put our individual seal on it, and ratify here and now our own part in it which He offered as representing us. Accept, then, what is now *our* sacrifice, the sacrifice of the Cross which, in Jesus, is humanity's representative sacrifice and, for us (by our presence here and by our here-and-now ratification), is our own sacrifice. We ratify and mean by it all that Christ meant by it. He meant obedience, self-surrender, love till death. We, as we make it our own, mean also obedience, self-surrender, love till death. Hence we offer our self-sacrifice, not in isolation—for then our offering would be worthless—but as part of, and identified with, the universal, complete, and perfect sacrifice which our Head and Brother, now truly present, once offered on the Cross.'

I wonder if any evangelical thinks that all wrong? Utterly and finally we repudiate any idea of a sacrifice which will ultimately avail for us without the

heart-submission of a converted will. If we come to this service and remain there unforgiving, unconverted, unloving, the service will remain as an item in the Church's homage to God, but we ourselves shall be untouched, unhelped, unsaved. But we do not come so, I trust. We come because we love God and want to offer Him the best thing possible, so we offer the sacrifice of Christ, commemorated in Christ's own way, enshrined in a liturgy approved by Christ's own Spirit-guided Church.

Some men disapprove of Eucharistic worship because they see that abuses have been connected with it; others because they do not understand the Incarnation and the representativeness of the Sacrifice; others because they do not love God, and think religion is simply a matter of saving their own souls, and worship a matter of cringing before God. We try to love God enough to forget our own souls sometimes, and occupy ourselves solely with the desire to offer our Friend something worth His acceptance. We find what we need in the mystery of the Eucharist.

So the priest comes to the altar to worship. And who can blame him if he finds in this service his chief opportunity to lift up to the Father, to Whom he is offering Christ's sacrifice, the needs of his parish, his people, his friends? As he offers the great sacrifice of worship and propitiation (rightly understood) he names the names of those he loves. Who can blame him? Is it not all good, all holy, all devotional?

Therefore you find that the real priest loves to offer the Holy Sacrifice. Because he loves God and loves his people, he will offer it every day if he can. The daily Eucharist is not a high-church fetish, it is the daily occasion when God can be worshipped most adequately, and the souls of men best sanctified by being presented —together with Christ's sacrifice—to the Father's heart.

Once understand the Eucharist, once love God, once feel true affection for your people, and the daily Eucharist becomes the highest blessing and privilege you can have.

There is no task a priestly priest loves more than to worship his Friend and help his friends through the great act of worship and supplication which the Church puts into his hand to offer.

Hence you will find that such a priest is almost shocked at a day that begins without the Eucharist. He leaves his parish on a visit and finds that the first corporate act of the day is breakfast. Private prayer has preceded it, no doubt—in some cases family prayer (as should always be). But when he thinks of all that the Eucharist means, its origin in the command of Christ, its power, and efficacy, and holiness, can you blame me for saying that he feels that there is no way of beginning a new day comparable to the great service in which he finds so much true peace and true joy in the glorifying of God and the helping of the world ?

(3) *The priest will administer Sacraments.*—Let

us try to decide with some finality what is the place of the Sacraments in the Christian life.

We can truly say that Sacraments are Means of Grace, but we want to know more than that. What is Grace ?

Now directly you ask that question you get into deep waters. I do not think that you can draw an accurate line round Grace ; but I think a very broad distinction holds true between Sacramental Grace and non-Sacramental Grace.

There is the sort of Grace which falls like the dew upon men. It awakens and stimulates or it blesses and edifies. It is absolutely real and, in Christians, is the effect of the Holy Spirit of Jesus at work in the world. It may take any form, from good thoughts which rise unbidden in the mind to outward accidents and concatenations of circumstance which tend to lead men's souls to God. A broken leg might frequently be an instance of non-Sacramental Grace, since it might give opportunity for reflection, and so for conversion and salvation.

But the other sort of Grace, Sacramental Grace, is all connected with incorporation into Christ.

John the Baptist was a saint, yet he was never incorporated into Christ. He was filled with non-Sacramental Grace, yet never partook of Sacramental Grace.

What is the explanation of Sacramental Grace ? As usual, the explanation is to be found in love.

God loves us and desires union with us. The

union He desires is the closest union possible, and therefore He made a way by which we might touch His Life, and have a union with Him which was not merely of affection, but of Life. And this way is the way of the Incarnation. For Christ came not to do two things only for us, but three things.

(*a*) He came and took our nature that as our Representative He might offer the sacrifice of a perfect and obedient manhood. This sacrifice we were subsequently to make our own in will, and to reproduce in our own individual and, of course, national life.

(*b*) He came to make atonement for our sins. For His death has a mysterious meaning which we cannot rightly fathom, yet Christian instinct—the instinct of penitent sinners—has always divined that the death was the climax of a struggle with the devil and sin and hell, and that His victory was our deliverance. There is probably also a sense in which His Atonement was necessary in order that God might forgive sins without harm. For if God had forgiven our sins without the Cross to remind us of what sin cost Him, we might have thought that sin did not matter much.

There are probably also other senses in which the death was an atonement, but these have to be thought out and felt out by us. Anyhow, it was an atonement.

(*c*) He came to make men saints and Godlike. That has often been forgotten: men's thoughts have stopped at the Cross. But He makes men Godlike not only by teaching them how to live on His principles,

not only by sending down his dew-like imperceptible Grace, but by imparting to them His own Life, so that henceforth we might—both here and hereafter—live in Him and He in us. (*cf.* 'he that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him'; St. John vi. 56. *cf.* also that most illuminating illustration of the Vine and the Branches, St. John xv. 5.)

Now it is in connection with this third consideration that light is thrown on the Sacraments. They are the means whereby this life of Christ Incarnate and glorified is imparted to us; they are the 'instrumenta' by which we are incorporated into Christ. That is why the Sacraments are so Christian: they are altogether connected with the Incarnate life of Christ. Non-christian mystics try to dispense with the Sacraments; the Church—whose theism is Christian theism—holds tight to the Sacraments, and with a sure instinct insists that the way to God is through Christ, and the way into Christ is by Faith and Grace.

Hence we see at once the explanation of the enormous importance attached to Baptism in the early Church and by Catholic teachers everywhere.

It puts you into Christ. Not merely did Baptism enlist you into the Church, not merely did it bestow actual power to be a good Christian, but the power sprang from actual incorporation into Christ. True that, once in Christ, you found yourself a member of a brotherhood whose common Head and source of Life was Christ, but incorporation into Christ

was the greater thing; membership in the Church was by comparison a corollary.

Hence the unique place of the Sacraments in the life and history of the Church. Never have they rightly taken the place of conversion: for conversion and Grace go hand-in-hand. But the Sacraments possibly give an even greater assurance than conversion, for the element of feeling in conversion is always a little variable, while Sacraments are confessedly a gift from God. That is one of the valuable sides to the Sacraments. You lean upon what God has done, and do not feel you have to do it all yourself. You must do your honest best. Your will must be submitted. Yet at bottom what a relief it is to remember that, dissatisfied as we are even with our best, we can come to God's institutions, where God meets us and gives us His gifts unspoilt by our fumbling. So Sacramental life is the new life in Christ, only possible to a Christian, only available through Christ's own instituted gifts. Others have had great spiritual blessings and graces, but not Sacramental life. That by God's institution is reserved for the new Humanity, the company of those 'in Christ,' the baptised.

Once grasp this, and you have grasped the Sacraments. They are the means of initiating and maintaining the life of incorporation into Christ.

Baptism is the beginning. There Christ takes the child into His arms and initiates it into His own family, communicates to it His own Life. Hence

we call baptised children 'regenerate' or 'new-born Christians,' for the baptised are reborn into a new and supernatural sphere; they are now members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.

And the rest of the Sacraments amplify and extend this initial relationship, this new life in Christ.

In Holy Communion Christ treats the soul as grown-up, and communicates to it His own Presence and Life. We cannot explain it. Yet He has promised it. We accept His words and are grateful to the Church, which has always insisted (and never more clearly than in the baptismal service of the Church of England) that the Sacraments convey life —the new life in Christ which makes men Godlike. Admitted that men have forgotten it, admitted that this new life must be kept bright and fresh by a converted will and a loving heart, still we have in the Church of England the fullest recognition of a life in Christ open to man, and of Sacraments as the means of initiating and sanctifying that life.

I shall be reminded that there are other sacramental ordinances besides Baptism and Holy Communion. True, but none which can compare in dignity and finality with the twin Sacraments of the Gospel.

The others are concerned with deepening and cleansing the life given in Baptism and crowned in Communion. Yet as these other sacramental ordinances have fallen into undeserved neglect among us, it might be well to pass them in review.

(1) Confirmation. This is the ordinance described in the eighth chapter of the Acts. It consists in the reception of the Holy Spirit given through the laying-on of a bishop's hands. It is the Sacrament of strength, as Baptism is the Sacrament of life. Confusion of the gift of the Spirit with the ratification of the baptismal promises (which is demanded of each candidate as a pledge of fitness for Confirmation) is merely an error due to ignorance.

(2) The Sacrament of penance, or Absolution. This is an ordinance of cleansing, unfortunately made necessary by post-baptismal sin. The power of absolving was given by Christ (St. John xx. 22), and is conferred on the priest at his Ordination (see Ordering of Priests, in the Book of Common Prayer). The Absolution is preceded by an acknowledgment and confession of sins made to God as an act of repentance, and made also in the presence of the priest to prove that the repentance is sincere. The hearing of the confession also gives the priest the opportunity of judging the penitent person's spiritual state, and so to give some advice. But the heart of the matter is the absolution which the priest pronounces in the name of God.

(3) Holy Order is the Sacrament whereby a bishop, priest, or deacon is commissioned to his office by laying-on of hands. The Church believes that her official acts done in Christ's name receive Christ's ratification, and are accompanied by a gift of the Spirit sufficient to enable the recipient

of the Sacrament to perform the duties of his office rightly.

(4) Holy Matrimony is the Sacrament by which natural marriage is raised to a supernatural rank. The essence of the ordinance is the mutual consent of the parties, which the law of the State requires to be given before witnesses, and the law of the Church to be given 'in facie ecclesiæ.' The gift given is grace to live holy in the married state.

(5) Holy Unction is a following out of the practice advocated by St. James of anointing a sick person with oil amid prayers. This Sacrament, though much neglected in the Church of England, is being gradually revived; the benefit is received both for body and for soul: the body receives the gift for healing, the soul for cleansing.

There are several points worth considering in connection with Sacraments. (1) It is a stumbling-block to many that God should work through such vulgar means as persons and things. Yet He does so because He blesses us on our human level. In this world all spiritual things come through material things—music through a string touched or a reed blown: affection through outward signs of smiles or kisses: even the most sacred married love is expressed through physical union. God employs human parents to people his world of spiritual beings. So in spiritual things. It is indeed the inner gift which matters, but it is conveyed through the ministration of persons and things—the Son of God Himself entered

the world as the child of a human mother, and took material human flesh. The Sacraments follow the method of the Incarnation by being the expression of Spirit through matter. (2) Another point well worth emphasis is the need of reverence in administering the Sacraments. There is always a danger of familiarity breeding contempt, and priests sometimes get careless about Sacraments. They come in late for Baptisms; they are slovenly in their mode of celebrating the Eucharist; they allow the furniture and linen of the altar to be untidy and unclean. All this is wrong. If the Sacraments are what churchmen believe them to be, you cannot be too circumspect or reverent in their administration, you cannot make their adjuncts too solemn and dignified. It cuts a devout communicant to the heart to attend a church where things are done in a slovenly way. Do not let us make this most grave and hurtful mistake. One ought to know how to celebrate correctly according to the best standards of Catholic usage. There are plenty of books, *e.g.* 'Ceremonial,' or 'The Priest to the Altar,' which would teach us how to celebrate reverently and rightly. Some think that priests ought to be left to their own self-prompted acts of reverence: how unworthy this is of the dignity of the central mystery of Catholic worship. Imagine such procedure at a coronation or a review. Ceremonial is made dignified by being correct. It is perfectly possible to express evangelical piety through right

and reverent ceremonial. Otherwise you have slovenly services punctuated with self-chosen acts of reverence which often run perilously nearly the grotesque.

And apart from specified and correct ceremonial the whole tone and manner of the priest at the altar must be truly recollected and reverent. He is having commerce with God; he is leading his people in worship; he is going to give them the Food of the most precious Body and Blood of Christ. I do not mean that he should use a reverence which is artificial and unreal, but that he should be so inwardly engrossed with the sanctity of the occasion that his manner and attitude instinctively express awe and reverence. A hurried manner, a too-rapid rendering of the words, any brusqueness or carelessness of action, suggest levity, and do harm.

Everything should be done without haste, yet without unnecessary gaps. As far as possible the personality and idiosyncrasies of the celebrant should be sunk in the priest. The celebrant is simply Catholic priest number X, not Mr. So-and-so, or Father this or that.

There are I believe persons—certainly not good Christians—who will go to Mass if Father X. is celebrating, but not otherwise. It is just possible that the alternative priest is hopelessly unpunctual or irreverent, which might be some excuse, but otherwise this dreadful attitude shows a wholly wrong conception of the service. The priest at the altar is God's priest, the Church's official; idiosyncrasies and personal traits are abso-

lutely out of place. That is one excellent reason for a ceremonial common to all: it reduces the possibilities of the obtrusion of a personality. The whole service should be quiet, reverent, unhurried, unindividualistic. Unless the Eucharist is right, the whole subordinate system of parish worship will be wrong.

You will think me unnecessarily insistent about this. I do not agree. My fate has been to travel a great deal in England, and so to visit a very large number of churches. Again and again one is put off and jarred by the maltreatment of the service by the celebrant. Some preach the Mass as if it were a sermon and not a sacrifice. Others say it so that—even if you are in the front row—you can hear nothing. Others bawl it as if to insist that even if you sit in the last row of the empty church you *shall* hear every word, whether you want to or not. Others are obviously self-conscious, and you feel that So-and-so is celebrating instead of just knowing that the Holy Mysteries are taking place. So I submit that the matter is worth much consideration, that you follow the best models you can find, in order that all things may be done decently and in order.

To sum up. The priest as priest has his own special functions which constitute his privilege and his responsibility. They are: to teach the official Christian beliefs; to offer the sacrifice of the altar; to administer the Sacraments duly. And all must be done in the spirit of a true pastor who loves his people and desires to honour his God. Therefore his performance of all his functions will be marked by a

humble, devout, and reverent manner, that so he may worship God truly and may commend our holy religion to the flock he has come to love.

Note on hearing confessions.—Every true priest will hear confessions sometimes. Every real religion makes use of confession: in fact, it is only when a form of religion is unreal that it dispenses with some form of confession of sins. The Salvation Army have their penitent form; Nonconformists use the enquiry room—these are just instances of religion when it is real pushing out instinctively towards confession of sin. And the Catholic Church has its own methods. It safeguards the sacredness of the confession by the rule of the seal: the priest who repeated anything said in confession would be suspended by his bishop. Again (and this is the difference between Church and nonconformity), the Church bestows formal absolution on the true penitent in the name of Christ. Again, the Church's ordinary custom is to appoint some penance after confession (usually something small and regarded as a guarantee of genuineness).

But though many confessions are heard in the Church of England, the preparation of the confessor is usually *nil.* He picks it up as he can, probably from the confessors who in the past have heard his own confessions. I think it may be useful if I add a translation of the rules for confessors which are given in Oldknow and Crake's 'The Priest's Book of Private Devotion' (pp. 440–444), based with slight omissions and alterations on those in the 'Rituale Romanum.'

But I would first submit some of my own experiences as to what we need for the task.

(1) Confessions should not only be heard openly in church, but it is often well to arrange to have some other person present in the church if you are otherwise alone with the person who is making a confession. This prevents any possible scandal.

(2) In hearing the confession, never interrupt or ask questions unless it is absolutely necessary.

(3) In order to give any advice needed, try and reckon up what is the root sin or disorder of which the various sins confessed are the symptoms. A person may confess twenty sorts of sins, yet the root may be simple and single, *e.g.* pride. In giving advice, deal with the root.

(4) On the whole, people need encouragement more than anything else. Life is not easy in this strenuous age, and people do not need too much rebuke or discouragement. Make the best of them. Be sympathetic in your attitude. Yet speak as little as possible. It is absolution they have come for. Advice they can often get from others, better than from you. Yet you must deal sternly with sentimentality or self-pity.

(5) In teaching about confession, dwell more on absolution. Confession is the condition, and develops humility and self-knowledge, but forgiveness and a new start are the end, and should be emphasised more.

(6) Do not be astonished if your people are not moved to confession for some time. Repentance

does not come either naturally or primarily to man. Ordinarily it comes at the fourth stage of religion, though, of course, there are exceptions. The normal order is (1) the stage of thinking; (2) the stage of real prayer; (3) the stage of real love of God; (4) the stage of repentance because we love. In natural life we often only feel our unworthiness when we begin to love deeply. So it is in spiritual things. Therefore in leading your people to repentance try and bring them along the right road: not, normally, expecting them to reach stage number 4 until they have graduated in stages number 1, 2, and 3. If you can lead them to love God, repentance follows almost automatically.

(7) The question of the method and desirability of leading our people to confession is not simple. Obviously if the Church has received the power of Absolution from our Lord, and if the Church has commissioned her priests to use this power, it is wrong and inexcusable not to tell our people perfectly clearly what this absolution is, and how to get it. I cannot see how this can be disputed. On the other hand, it is only honest to face the fact that the Church of England in her formularies leaves the decision of using this Means of Grace to the individual soul. The Church of England invites him (and in cases of sickness moves him) to use this means of cleansing, if his conscience is unquiet with sin. Some people think that the Church of England is wrong here, and ought to prescribe confession (say) once a year, just as she prescribes Communion three times a year. The Church of

England, they argue, does not leave Communion to the individual choice; she ought not to have left confession so. Less harm is done by compulsory confession than by the neglect of self-examination which our voluntary system begets. This is a very fair argument, but it has yet to face what the Church of England has actually done. There is no doubt that she contemplates people confessing their sins privately to God and finding peace; though she also contemplates other cases where they will not find peace, and should therefore seek sacramental absolution. We may like this or not, but it remains the fact. But some upholders of compulsory confession will say, 'Ah! but what is the Church of England? Either she is a part of the Catholic Church, in which case she has no right to alter a custom so prevalent, or else she is not a part of the Catholic Church, and we ought to leave her.'

Believing, as they do, that she *is* part of the Catholic Church, they deny her right to have altered the old custom, and they therefore introduce what is—morally—compulsory confession on the ground that the Church of England is mistaken in having made any alteration. I must confess that there is something unreal to me in this. Facts are facts, and the Church of England is at least an historical body with a history, a body which has—for good or evil—altered some of the old customs and practices. Has she therefore forfeited her Catholicity? Some of us think not. I quite understand some people leaving her as being a futile

body; I quite understand others teaching confession as voluntary, and yet urging the custom of the rest of the Church as one reason for using the sacramental form of absolution. I could wish that every one would use it—at a certain stage—for multitudes owe their very souls to it. Yet to make it morally compulsory seems to me wrong, if we are to be living and working under the system of the Church of England. You may, in certain parishes, bustle your people into it (and in dealing with very sinful or very ignorant and childlike people you are probably right), yet there is something rather furtive and individualistic about it, if you attempt to make it compulsory for all and sundry. In your heart of hearts you know you are acting beyond the limits which the Church of England permits and enjoins. I cannot help thinking that we gain by frankness, and by trusting more both to the Holy Spirit and to our people's honesty. We trust that the Holy Spirit will make them very unhappy and dissatisfied with a superficial repentance, and we trust that our people will respond to a sober appeal to the invitation of the Church of England. No doubt we have a perfect right to emphasise our appeal by the considerations of the custom of the rest of the Church, and of the great help to honesty and penitence which sacramental confession affords.

Yet having done all this I feel qualms about regarding our people as necessarily unrepentant or disloyal to their religion if they use their discretion. In practice they are often not so at all: they are good and pious in

a way that puts us to shame. I think one rightly feels suspicious of anyone who makes a parade of Catholicity and yet shies at this searching test. Yet as a matter of practical politics I believe we do best by perfect frankness and honesty, explaining carefully how the land lies and trusting to their desire—when converted—to use all possible means of cleansing. I believe that, when all is said, the way to bring people to confession is to convert them ; they will be anxious to do everything possible then. Yet I must again say that there are some sinners for whom it seems the only possible way : they must go through the mill before they can get to the bottom of their own selfishness and grossness. I agree with the Salvation Army there as well as with the normal Catholic practice. How difficult it all is : and yet it is not our doing. It results from a situation—a divided Church. And for that division who is responsible ? Ah ! that is a hard question to answer. I can only say for myself that there is no part of my religion I would surrender with greater fear and misery than confession. I mean to go regularly all my life. I know it is the means of bringing multitudes to real humility and real penitence for the first time. I know that for many of us it is part of conversion. I shall never try, or even wish, to make it compulsory myself, yet I know I shall never cease my endeavours—by prayer and example and loving persuasion—to bring all I deem capable of receiving it, to this great and effectual gateway of peace and joy.

I subjoin the directions for confessors of which I spoke above.

I

In order that the holy Sacrament of penance—instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ for the purpose of restoring into the Grace of God those who have fallen into post-baptismal sin—may be duly and rightly administered, let the confessor first of all remember that he has to sustain the part both of judge and of physician, and accordingly let him equip himself with the utmost knowledge and skill, by earnest prayer to God, and by diligent study of approved authorities, so that he may be a competent judge, distinguishing between sin and sin, and a physician skilful in healing the diseases of the soul, and in applying the right remedy to each particular case.

II

When the confessor is summoned to hear a confession let him show himself ready and most willing ; and if he has time, before he begins he shall earnestly ask God's help to perform this sacred duty in a reverent and proper way.

III

Let it be in a church that he hears confessions, and not in private houses unless there be reasonable cause ; but when there is good reason for hearing a confession in a house let it be heard in some suitable and open spot.

IV

If the penitent be unknown to him, let him ask about his religious state : how long it is since his last confession : and did he perform his penance ? Whether his past confessions have been honest and full ; whether he has good knowledge of the Christian religion ; whether he has examined himself carefully, as he should. But as a rule it is better to ask such questions after the confession has ended rather than before it is begun.

V

If he shall have gathered that the penitent is ignorant of the elements of the Christian Faith, if time permits let him give him some short instruction on the rudiments of the Faith and other points that his salvation requires that he should know. And let him censure his ignorance and admonish him to study these things more earnestly for the future.

VI

Let him hear the confession with patience and help out the penitent when necessary, but let him never interrupt unless the matter needs to be made clearer. But let him gently and humanely instil confidence into the penitent that he may confess all his sins sincerely and completely, and not give way to that snare of the devil into which some having stumbled have not had the courage to confess all their sins, out of a foolish and ill-advised sense of shame.

VII

If the penitent has not made sufficiently clear the number and kind and circumstances of his sins, let the priest question him with caution. And if after such consideration he has reasonable ground or suspicion that the confession is not full and honest, let him tactfully examine him on the points he suspects are being held back, especially concerning the sins which are commonest in the penitent's condition of life ; he shall do this more searchingly if nothing of the sort has been confessed so far.

VIII

Yet let him beware of asking questions which are useless or rise from curiosity, especially in the case of younger people. And let him not be foolish enough to raise questions on subjects of which they are ignorant, lest they be caused to stumble and thence learn to sin.

IX

Then when the confession is over, after making due allowance for the gravity and quality of the sins committed, as well as for the condition and circumstances of the penitent, he will make use of such rebuke and warning as his fatherly love suggests ; will try to lead him to sorrow and contrition by the right advice ; will lead him to a better amending and ordering of his life ; and will show him the best remedies for his sins.

X

Finally, let him enjoin some healthful and suitable 'satisfaction' such as his instinct and sense will suggest, due regard being paid to the state in life, condition, sex, and even the temperament of the penitent. Let him beware of imposing trivial penances for grave sins, lest he become partaker of other people's sins by unwittingly conniving at them. Let him keep this point ever before him, that the 'satisfaction' shall serve not only as a safeguard for a better life in future, and as a medicine for weakness, but also as a correction for past sins.

XI

But let him take all the trouble he can to enjoin penances which are the contraries to the sins committed; *i.e.* he should enjoin almsgiving to the avaricious, fasting and other mortifications of the flesh to the fleshly, works of humility to the proud, devotional studies to the backsliders. Let him in short prescribe to each those remedies by which he hopes they will be best weaned from their sins; above all (let him commend) daily exercise in prayer—especially mental prayer—and a reverent frequenting of the Sacraments.

XII

Let the priest take great care as to when and to what persons absolution ought to be given, or withheld, or deferred; so that he may give it regularly

to those in a right disposition : withhold it from those in a wrong disposition : such latter cases to include those who give no sign of sorrow, those who are not willing to put away all hatreds and enmities, those who will not restore other people's property where they can, those who will not forsake proximate occasions of sin, those who in some other way are not willing to give up their sins and amend their lives for the better : those also who have given public scandal, unless they make public satisfaction and remove the scandal.

XIII

Among those of doubtful disposition habitual sinners also are as a rule to be reckoned ; to whom therefore absolution as a rule is not to be applied apart from some necessity, and where there is no marked improvement, especially if on more than one occasion in the past they have broken a promise [1] which they had made.

XIV

The priest must be sure to remember not to give a heavy or exhausting penance to sick people, but to prescribe something only which they can fulfil at the proper time if they have recovered. For the time being let some prayer or light penance suitable to the illness be imposed and acquiesced in, and let the sick be absolved, as need requires.

[1] A promise of avoiding occasions of sin, etc.

XV

Finally, above and beyond the goodness, knowledge, and prudence required for hearing confessions, it is of necessity also that he should preserve the seal of private confession unbroken, under a silence absolute and perpetual; and for that purpose let him never say or do anything at any time which directly or indirectly tends to reveal some sin or defect known only from a confession. Nor must he ever dare to use knowledge gained from confession to the detriment or danger of the penitent; nor ought he to speak even in general terms of sins heard in confession unless there be dire necessity; and even then with the greatest discretion and prudence, so that not even a breath of suspicion may arise against particular persons; nor should even such general knowledge be referred to in presence of those who are not priests, lest perchance they be offended.

It sounds very presumptuous to make any comments on the excellent rules thus based on those which the Roman Church lays down for confessors.

Yet the situation in the Church of England regarding the use of this sacramental ordinance being different from the situation in the Roman Communion makes for a slightly different treatment of those who use it. The risk of bad confessions in the Church of England is—on the whole—small, since as a rule such people simply would not come. Again, one may

take it as an act of courage and real penitence that any person comes at all, considering everything. Therefore our attitude should be most encouraging and sympathetic, and absolution should be withheld only when we are quite sure that the persons are flippant or obdurate. Even in cases where they have fallen again and again into the same sin, one should never refuse absolution if only they are still trying.

I can only add that I think it most advisable that priests should sit at regular times and in a set place to hear confessions, so that timid and humble souls should be able to come without the ordeal of having to make an appointment. A notice should be put in the porch, and the whole thing made as open and healthy and normal as possible. My own experiences have not always been happy. I was once in a certain quarter of London for a few hours and was anxious to make my confession before catching a train. In the first church I entered, I saw one of the clergy, and asked him if they heard confessions there, and he said No, not as a rule. The whole aspect of the church and the whole attitude of the priest made me very miserable, so I went elsewhere. There the priest eyed me as if I were a notable criminal, and said: 'Who are you?' I replied, rather resentfully I fear, 'A sinner needing absolution,' and again went empty away, feeling hurt that I had been asked a question so unfair, and had been treated so untenderly.

Let us not make these unloving and unpastoral

mistakes. The ministry of absolution is a most tender and touching ministry. We deal with sinners who seek the Saviour and come to kiss His feet. With what love and courtesy and humility and tenderness should we not treat them? Is there a more Christ-like ministry than this?

CHAPTER VII

THE PRIEST AS MISSIONER

No doubt the work of a missioner needs a special vocation. It is a specialist's work, as is also work for children or among lads, and needs—as they do —special qualifications. Yet the parish priest will often long to preach 'mission sermons' or to have a 'mission course' in Advent or Lent, and he will do well to examine himself as to whether he is not himself capable of doing this work without calling in the aid of a specialist from outside. I do not mean that he should not employ specialist missioners for the parochial mission, which ought normally to be held in his parish at least every ten years, but I do suggest that every parish priest should be as capable as possible of preaching a mission sermon or a mission course.

Ordinary parish work and preaching must be largely for edification. It is mostly humdrum plodding work, which goes on faithfully year in and year out. Yet the parish needs not only a decennial earthquake, but certain annual shakings up and recruiting campaigns, lest the teaching and normal practices

of religion become stale and dry as the dry bones in the great valley. Hence we have Advent and Lent 'courses' which are pre-eminently 'missionary': for what could be more of a mission nature than the usual Advent course of the Four Last Things?

Therefore a priest need not think he is debarred from mission work because he is not a mission specialist or expert: every priest should be capable of doing such minor mission work as falls his way. Let us then inquire into the objects and methods of a mission, taking it as agreed that what applies to a full-blown parochial mission will apply also, *mutatis mutandis*, to any serious mission course.

Now to my mind a mission is the application to a parish of Christianity in concentrated form, and at one blow.

What is normally spread out over years and done quietly and almost imperceptibly, is here done in (say) ten days, and with hurricane force. You try to crowd the whole converting and teaching force of the Church into a ten-days' spasm. You work with compressed air: you use a powerful driving force. I do not say that excitement is the main feature; it is not, though there must be some excitement (and why not, I should like to know—the human heart is not moved by cold-blooded philosophy), yet there is no doubt that force and driving power must be there. It will be present in the missioner's own heart and will; it will be there in the presence of the Holy

Spirit; it will be there in the passionate goodwill of the sympathisers with the mission.

A mission is like a political campaign; it makes actual and concrete what has before seemed rather far away and unreal. It concentrates 'attention' (as the psychologists would say) upon the subject of Christianity, and by leading people to 'pay attention' to it, it may lead them to accept it.

So a mission might be compared to a scene like this. Imagine a picture-palace where certain pictures were thrown on the screen—let us say (as I am writing in November 1914), scenes of the life and training of 'Kitchener's Army.' The object of representing those scenes is to concentrate attention on them, to rouse interest, to stimulate patriotism, to persuade men to enlist, and so embark on a new and (at the moment) higher and more patriotic life. Imagine that a network of sympathisers had been formed and trained for months to circularise the district, to invite men, to accost passers-by, and all with one motive—to persuade them to come and see the pictures, with the ultimate object of getting them to join the new army.

Now this is exactly a mission. The church is commandeered for ten days or so: all ordinary services retire into the background. A special preacher will present certain scenes, arguments, considerations; the parish workers and other helpers have been canvassing people to come, and every effort is made to get people inside, so that they may—by God's

grace—pay attention, listen, be aroused, be converted, and so join God's great army of Christian warriors and saints.

And in each case the promoters of such campaigns are certain that they are helping forward both an external and an internal good. Success, to Kitchener's recruiting agents, means a benefit for the country, and a benefit for the recruits—they will be better men for joining. So with a mission. To all mission-workers success means not only the glory of God through the rightful homage and love now, at last, given Him by His own once-wayward children, but also an infinite blessing received by the converted who, by their conversion, are better men and women —better because more at rest, more joyful, more in harmony with the Will of God, which is their real and eternal peace.

So this may be said to be the end and object of a mission. It is a large-scale effort, conducted by competent people who are themselves strenuously backed by the whole already converted strength of a parish, and by any others who wish it well. It has as its object to concentrate the attention of the largest possible number of persons upon Christianity—its claims and offers, its truth and joy. It hopes and believes that as a result of that concentration the largest possible number of recruits will enter the Kingdom, and also that the greatest number of old soldiers will be freshly enheartened and better equipped. And behind all is the honest belief that

the success of the mission means joy to God and peace and power to mankind.

Now if these things are so, it stands to reason that certain points are of supreme importance. You must have the right showman who knows, loves, and understands his pictures, *and believes in them;* you must have pictures adequate and clear and worthy of the subject ; and you need a plant and organisation capable of inviting, receiving, and dealing with any quantity of recruits.

Now I do not think I need deal with the third of these requirements, viz. the organisation of a mission. It is of the greatest importance. It needs a real mind at the head of the organisation ; it needs prayer and unselfishness ; it means loyal subordination and co-operation among workers (not always easy : plenty of good Christianity wanted here) ; it means honest slogging preparation-work done ; it means common sense and plain advertisement. It means also the striking of a careful balance—different in each parish—as to the exact amount of advertisement and invitation necessary and advisable ; too little, leaves your people cold and unresponsive : too much, makes them bored and impatient. However, as my book is on 'Priesthood,' I do not intend to go into the question of the organisation side of a mission ; I think Father Paul Bull has dealt with it in his book on 'Missions.' But I do propose to deal with the missioner and his message, and, finally, to append a short specimen mission course.

What sort of man then is a real missioner? and what are his qualifications?

(I) He must have some specially real insight into the needs and pathos of humanity. No cold-hearted person will do; he will be best employed elsewhere—if the world wants him at all, which I doubt. No very young person will do—he has not sufficient experience of life. No very clear-cut person will do who divides humanity into sharp classes of good and bad, converted and unconverted, sheep and goats. That is not true to life, where things are very mixed. You want a person who has suffered a bit, and knows what it is to be disappointed and tempted, but yet clings on to the ideal. A very successful, self-contented man will not do. You want a man who has had sorrows and trials of his own, and has learnt from them to feel compassionate towards that whole humanity which also is heir to these things. You want him, as he takes his place in the pulpit and gazes down on the faces before him, to be saying to himself, 'These are God's people: these are God's sheep. Every one of them in some way is in need, is helpless, is pathetic. O God, if only I could help them!'

He has penetration to see below the surface: he can feel that there are present before him the tempted, the despondent, the afflicted, the unhappy, the fallen. Everybody, he feels, is capable of the highest of all destinies, of being knit into the Life and Heart of God; while equally they are capable of the utmost of all miseries, the loss of God and the never-ending

wandering in dreary darkness where the soul is useless to God and a deadly weariness to itself. He must be capable of weeping over his congregation as the Lord was capable of weeping over Jerusalem.

In short, (1) the missioner must be primarily a loving human being, and after that a missioner. If you find him a man of precise and rule-of-thumb methods, a missioner before he is a man—try and get somebody else.

(2) The missioner must have some spiritual experience of his own which he is longing to impart.

A missioner must be a converted man, who—however unworthy and helpless in himself—really loves God and finds happiness in religion.

There are many good men who serve God out of a sense of duty. This is good Christianity, and indeed constitutes the first stage of Christian service. Yet it does not qualify as a missioner : the missioner must love God also. There are many men, good and excellent, who—not from their own fault, but probably from temperament—have no felt love of God or of the Saviour. Do I blame these men, or call them unworthy ? God forbid. But I do say that they have no vocation yet as missioners. They can teach, they can do many things—if they are priests—but they cannot be missioners yet.

So the missioner must be longing to impart this felt love and joy of his. He must be convinced that the surrender to God and the becoming God's recruit will result in peace and joy and happiness.

It would be a cold religion indeed that invited men to unhappiness. And it certainly would not be God's religion. God invites us all to supreme joy and happiness, only He tells us that this joy and happiness is not obtainable along the road most men imagine. It is attained by taking up the Cross : most people do not know this. They try the road of self-seeking and selfish pleasure, and therefore fail to find what they seek.

But God wills us all to be supremely happy : it is a blasphemy to think otherwise—and the missioner, having already had a foretaste of this happiness, having already glimpsed the Elysian fields, is all agog to lead others thereto. He has a way to disclose, a secret to impart, a joy to share.

It is when you feel all this yourself (and many do feel it), that you may believe that you are meant to be a missioner.

(3) The missioner must have some gift of speech and mother-wit ; some marked power of persuasiveness. I suppose this is simply the gift of God : yet practice will always prove it to you, one way or the other. If you cannot put your felt love and joy into some sort of words, or make your appeal and invitation clear, then you may be a devotional writer and a saint, yet not a missioner.

However, this is a point which will become quite clear to you after a few years of ordinary preaching.

(II) What, then, will be the missioner's message ? It is conceivable that it may take almost any form.

It might be a series of sermons on the parables or the miracles of Our Lord; it might be lessons from the Psalms, the prophets, or the Gospels. All ways that lead souls to God are justifiable. But it is well to bear in mind that the two great spheres of mission work are preaching and teaching—persuasion of the will and enlightenment of the mind. Thus the 'evening service,' which is the central service of the mission, is generally divided into sermon and instruction, and the order in which they are taken depends on the mood in which you want to leave your people at the end. For instance, let us suppose you are treating of repentance. The sermon is, let us say, going to be based on the moving story of St. Mary Magdalene, and the instruction is a straightforward talk on the three parts of real repentance, viz. contrition, confession, satisfaction.

Now if I had a Celtic congregation, easily moved and needing hard-headed instruction more than anything else, I should, personally, start with the sermon and end with the instruction; the people would then go away with the thinking part of themselves dominant. But if I were talking to a hard-headed, unemotional set of people, I should open with the instruction (which would possibly leave them in, I hope, a more enlightened, but possibly also in a more or less antagonistic state of mind, especially if I had dealt with confession) and end with the sermon, trusting that the instruction would remain in their minds while the sermon would have smoothed away

the irritability and rendered them more ready to accept the teaching.

Granted then that we mean both to preach and to teach, how shall we choose our subject? As I have said above, the missioner must choose, but I am anxious to deprecate fancy subjects. The foundations of all must be brought in somehow: God, sin, and salvation. Why should we not put before them the whole scheme of Christian faith and practice in some portable form? then, if they accept it, they will know how they stand, and will have been converted not by any side issue but by the whole massive presentation of the Christian religion.

In which case, what will be the sort of form in which the Christian religion can be put?

I suggest that you might turn into ten or eleven (or more) sermons the great articles of the Christian Faith, viz.—

(1) God and the needs of man.

(2) Sin and repentance.

(3) Redemption by { Incarnation. Atonement. Grace.

(4) The Holy Spirit.

(5) The New Life of joy and peace.

This course would be associated with a similar number of instructions on Christian practice—*i.e.* the fruits of a right belief, viz.—

(1) Conversion.

(2) Prayer.

(3) Worship.

(4) The Church.

(5) The Sacraments (this may need two or three instructions).

(6) Holiness (includes instruction on humility, purity, etc.).

This—however roughly done—at least covers the ground as to what a Christian should believe, do, and be. And one's business would be to present each sermon in as attractive form and setting as was possible. Repentance might be worked to through the Prodigal Son or St. Mary Magdalene. Sin through Judas, and so on.

And no doubt the main scheme might be punctuated by sermons conveying a direct appeal for decision or perseverance or honesty or some other virtue. But the scheme would be a whole, and would have the great advantage of being cumulative and connected. It is obvious that you might interchange these two forms of mission presentation. You might make sermons out of the practices, and instructions out of the Articles of the Faith. But—with that taken for granted—I should like to say that the sermon must be weighty, piercing, grave, responsible : while the instruction is a sheer talk, interlarded with asides, matter-of-fact illustrations, and homely applications, as much as you like. Whole evenings on the deep notes of gravity and awful seriousness would be overwhelming : you must have some relief, and that relief is supplied by the lighter touch of the instruction.

I will now—with humility—append a suggested course on these lines, submitting them not at all to be followed necessarily, but as a concrete standard to be criticised or varied to any extent.

But perhaps I should preface my course with two remarks, in case I am writing for any who have never taken part in any mission.

(*a*) Vary your course as much as you like, provided you have some definite message of conversion and edification to give. Only you must be clear beforehand. 'I want them to be at least *this*;' 'I want them to know at least *that*.' A dozen sermons as unconnected subjects designed to produce no definite clear-cut effect seem to me useless: not a mission at all.

(*b*) You must remember that though the mission-preaching is the central business of a mission, yet there are auxiliary aids. Hymns (very carefully chosen) help much. I have known one particular hymn 'make' a mission.

Again, it is most useful to get your congregation to learn things by heart, especially if the instruction is connected up with any tags or rhymes learnt. All sorts and kinds of tags can be used: personally I always get my congregation to say after me, again and again, the answer to the question: 'What must a child of God do, who wants to be a real Christian?'

A child of God must pray and worship.
A child of God must have a converted heart.
A child of God must use the Sacraments.
A child of God must live a loving and a holy life.

Of course it is only a tag, but I coax them to say it regularly: and, after all, if you look at it, it does contain the essentials of a Christian life. And so it comes to act as a sort of skeleton for the instructions and holds the whole thing together, so that the instructions become one coherent whole, instead of a series of disjointed discourses. So we say this little lesson two or three times over before the instruction each night, and after that they never forget it.

Again, it is important to have some united prayer in a mission. I don't think strings of collects quite meet the case. Personally, I believe in little simple prayers repeated by the whole congregation, kneeling, *e.g.*—

O my God, I believe in thee, help Thou mine unbelief.

O my God, I hope in Thee, because of Thy promises.

O my God, I love Thee,[1] because Thou lovest me; teach me to love Thee more and more.

O my God, I am very sorry[1] that I have ever sinned against Thee, and by Thy Grace I will try to sin no more.

These little prayers should be said clause by clause by the missioner, who stands among the kneeling people, and they repeat them after him. If you know nothing about these things you would be surprised at the change from the shallow and half-hearted 'My God, I desire to love Thee' of the first day to the

[1] Perhaps better, in the earlier stages of the mission, 'I desire to love thee,' 'I desire to be very sorry.'

fervent and sometimes tearful intensity of the 'My God, I love Thee' of a week later.

And I should add that both extempore prayers and intercessions—for the mission in general and for particular and special causes and persons—should run through the whole mission.

Note.—In the whole organisation of a mission there should be an entire absence of fuss. You do your honest best and leave the rest to God. An over-anxious fussy mission is a nuisance and a failure.

SCHEME OF A TEN DAYS' MISSION.

FIRST SUNDAY EVENING.

SERMON—ON GOD.

St. Luke xv. 18:

I will arise and go to my Father.

POINT I.

To-night I am going to talk to you about God, and your souls.

For all missions must be about these two great subjects.

Let us at once ask two questions.

(1) { Why do we need God?
{ Can't we do without Him?

(2) { What does God do for us?
{ What does He offer us?

POINT IIA.

Why do we need God?

(1) *We need God because of our own needs.*

(*a*) For we've got to die.

(*b*) We've got to live,

to be good: happy: brave: useful: clean.

Can we do all this without God?

(2) *We need God because of our sins.*
For we need not only help but pardon.
For though capable of good—we have been bad.
And because badness { hurts God, / hurts us,
We need God's forgiveness.

(3) *We need God if we are to fulfil our destiny.*
We are meant for God: but we shall never achieve Him without His help.

POINT IIB.

What, again, has God done for us?

(1) *God has created us as His children.* (expand.)

(2) *God has redeemed us by His Son,*
Whose Atonement is the price of our forgiveness.

(3) *God sanctifies us*
By His Spirit, through Whom He offers us salvation, daily help, Eternal life in Christ.

POINT III. (Conclusion.)

Let us then make our first mission resolve to seek and find God.
To accept His salvation.
To get His pardon.
To come regularly to the Mission to learn about Him.

INSTRUCTION—PRAYER.

PRELIMINARY.

What are the four things a child of God must do to become a good Christian?

Answer. A child of God must pray and worship, etc.
(To be said each night before the instruction, the whole congregation repeating it.)[1]

PRAYER.

(1) *What is prayer?*
A lifting up of the heart and mind to God.
Getting into touch with God and keeping there, etc.

[1] *cf.* p. 109.

(2) *When do we pray?*

At any time: but always we say morning and evening prayers. Also whenever we fall into temptation, etc.

(3) *In what spirit do we pray?*

In the spirit of a child talking to a loving Father.

(4) *What are the different parts of prayer?*

Praise and worship.
Thanksgiving.
Petition.
Asking for pardon.

cf. The Lord's Prayer.

All this is said as a talk: with repetitions, variations, illustrations, and so on.

FIRST MONDAY.

SERMON—ON SIN.

St. Matthew xxvi. 21, 22:

And as they did eat, He said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray Me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began, every one of them, to say unto Him, *Lord, is it I?*

POINT I.

I was talking to you last night about God, and your own destiny.

How God is your Master, your Friend.
How He made you for eternity.
How He means you to share His Life for ever.

I want you utterly to grasp that—

To know that you will never be your real self, your best self, your happy self, apart from God.

But when you have really grasped that, then I have a harder task,

To tell you that it is possible to lose God, to be separated from God.

And that which separates us is *Sin.*
Sin, which alone can ruin us, can part us from God.

POINT IIA.

Now what is sin?

Let us grapple with it so as to fear it,
hate it,
avoid it.

Sin is lawlessness.

It resides in the will.

Sin is { Human freewill opposing God's Will.
Man ordering himself apart from God.
Out-of-touchness with God.

Let us first examine the manifestations of this sin, this lawlessness.

(*a*) Devilry and vileness.
Delight in evil.
Dragging others down.
e.g. White Slave traffic.

(*b*) Rebellion.
The irreligious.
The open adulterer or blasphemer.

(*c*) Selfishness.
Passing God by.
Making self our centre instead of God and others, so that a man will gratify himself at any cost: gold,
power,
lust,
ease.

(*d*) Weakness.
Sloth, feebleness, cowardice,
Until our ideals wax dim and fade away.

POINT IIB.

Such are sin's manifestations: let us now examine sin's results also.

Let us face these results, however little we like the process.

(1) *Sin separates from God.*
cf. St. Paul—
They who do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.

Hence our Lord's emphatic warning—
If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out. . . .
If thy foot offend thee, cut it off. . . .
He knew that sin separates from God,
that is why He warns us so urgently.

(2) *Sin spoils the sinner.*
We see that clearly enough in drunkards,
in selfish people,
in ourselves, also.

(3) *Sin crucifies*
Jesus Christ Who loves us, but also those we injure.
cf. The drunkard's wife.
The selfish man's home.
Look at prostitution.

(4) *Sin renders useless.*
While we remain in sin we cannot help God
in His great tasks of redeeming human life.

POINT III. (Conclusion.)

Now I want you to look within—honestly.
Is there anything in *your* past,
Is there anything in *your* present,
which { Separates you from God.
Spoils your life.
Crucifies Christ or others.
Makes you useless to God and man ?

Look, look and see.
Have you been betraying God by your sins ?

Sins of action { Language.
Irreligion.
Unkindness.
Pride.
Impurity.
Dishonesty.
Lies.

or of character { Low aim.
Ignoble life.
Self-pleasing.
Unpitying.

Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray Me.
It is good to ask ourselves sometimes, Lord, is it I ? is it I ?

INSTRUCTION—CONVERSION.[1]

(1) *What is conversion?*

Turning.

Turning from one thing to another. One set of opinions to another. One course of action to another.

e.g. From Conservatism to Socialism, or *vice versa.*

Religious conversion.

Turning to God.

Turning from $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{evil}\\\text{indifference}\end{matrix}\right\}$ to God.

Turning your back on the world, the flesh, the devil, and submitting, surrendering to the love, the claims, the Will, of God.

(2) *Does conversion mean a violent change of feelings?*

Not necessarily. It is the *will* that really matters. Feelings help, and often enable us to start, but it is the will that really matters.

(3) *Is conversion always sudden?*

Not always: sometimes.

St. Paul's conversion was sudden; St. John's was slow, as far as we can judge. But in some form *necessary for all.*

(4) *Notes on conversion.*

(*a*) *Conversion must be thorough.*

If you turn to God, you must leave no corners unswept in the house of your soul.

'I'll give up *all* I know to be wrong.'

'I'll do *all* I know to be right.'

(*b*) *Conversion must be prayed for.*

For it is a gift from God. No man can convert us, and we cannot convert ourselves. But God will give it to us if we ask Him. Let us pray for it for ourselves and for others too, etc.

[1] This could be taken as the first of the instructions instead of prayer, to which it is logically prior. But I prefer to get a little way into the Mission before dealing with so vital a subject.

(*c*) *Conversion must be deepened.*

We never end being converted. Our business is to safeguard and deepen God's gift by prayer : meditation : study.

FIRST TUESDAY.

SERMON—ON REDEMPTION.

Revelation iii. 20 :

Behold, I stand at the door, and knock : if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me.

POINT I.

I always think this is one of the most wonderful verses in the Bible.

So quiet.
So humble—and yet the offerer is God !

He stands waiting outside.

Knocking and listening (with lantern in hand, as in Holman Hunt's picture).
Hopeful, yet hopeless :
For the door has been barred so long, and the creepers have trailed across.
Will the door ever open ?

Why does He stand knocking at your heart ?

What has He got to say ?
Why does He trouble us ?

POINT IIA.

He knocks at your heart, because He has something to say to your soul.

You remember Sunday's message of God's love to us—it's all true.
You remember yesterday's sorrowful lesson that
Sin separates,
Sin spoils.
It's all true : and we've all sinned.

So Jesus knocks at your heart to tell
you He has done something for you.
Something : which has paid sin's price.
Something : which can wash away our sin.
Something : which can restore the old friendship with God.
And He offers this ' something ' to you
and all its benefits—if only you will let Him in.

Point IIb.

What is this ' something ' which Jesus has done for us ?
What is the price He has paid ?
Will you listen to the story again ?

(*a*) *Let us go to Bethlehem* 1915 *years ago.*
Let us gaze at { A stable. / A manger. / A mother and her Babe.

What is this ?
It is the Nativity of Incarnate God.
For us God has become Man.
It is part of what Jesus has done for us to take away our sin and restore us to God.

(*b*) *Let us go to Gethsemane.*
Enter the garden.
The Saviour kneels in agony.
Meeting sin.
Lo ! the drops of blood on His brow !

What is this ?
It is the Blood without which you could have had no remission.

(*c*) *Let us go to Calvary.*
Behold the Cross, on which our Friend hangs.
The soldiers.
The mother.
See the Blood pour !

What is this ?
It is sacrifice. The sacrifice He makes to save your soul.

(*d*) *Let us mount to an upper chamber in Jerusalem.*

See the glad Apostles.
Hear a sudden rushing, mighty Wind!

What is this?

This is the Spirit of the Risen and glorified Saviour come to enter your heart, and to make you—in Christ—a child of the Father's Heart.

POINT III. (Conclusion.)

Behold, I stand at the door and knock!

Will you let Him in, and humbly accept the pardon and grace He brings?
Will you accept Redemption?

I know all it means—to say Yes.

It means repentance for you.
It means giving up what is wrong.
It means following the right.
It means carrying the cross of Jesus.

But still He knocks. Won't you listen? Will you never let Him in?

INSTRUCTION—WORSHIP.

Repeat what a child of God must do—
'A child of God must . . . worship.'

(1) *What is the highest way in which God can possibly be worshipped?*

Is it by praise? No.
Is it by petition? No.
It is by sacrifice.

How did the Jews worship God? By sacrifice.
How did Christ worship the Father? By the sacrifice of Himself.

So the highest, best, unique way of worshipping God is by Sacrifice.

(2) *Is there a Christian sacrifice?*

Yes. The Holy Eucharist is the Christian sacrifice.
Not a new sacrifice.
It adds nothing to the One Sacrifice, but is a commemorative sacrifice.

(*cf.* Prayer Book Catechism—

Q. Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained ?

A. For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ.)

Note.—In this sacrifice—

(1) Christ is present to be offered (by His own promise).

(2) We show forth His death before God and man ; *i.e.* we offer a commemorative sacrifice.

(3) We feed on the sacrifice, *i.e.* Holy Communion. *cf.* Hymn 322 (A. & M.) for both aspects of this service.

Thus every time a Eucharist is offered God is honoured and worshipped, by being reminded (if we may use the phrase) of Jesus : and of His sacrifice : and of all that means to God and man.

(3) *We must remember to add our own self-sacrifice to the presentation of Christ's sacrifice.*

Our Lord's sacrifice was made for us, but we must make it our own, by offering it *and sharing in it.*

(4) *What, then, is our practical duty of worship ?*

To go to the Eucharist at least every Sunday, not only to Communicate, but also to worship God in the highest way we can, *i.e.* by offering the Christian sacrifice.

FIRST WEDNESDAY.

SERMON—DECISION.

St. Mark x. 21, 22 :

And Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest : go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor . . . and he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved, for he had great possessions.

POINT I.

Yes, it had come at last!

The blow he feared.
His special vocation.
And it broke him!

For he had been listening to Jesus.

So much he agreed with.
'Hear, hear!' at intervals.

But deep in his heart a voice said—

YOU are called to something special.
No half measures for you.
You must leave comfort,
Follow the Teacher,
Lay up treasure in Heaven,
Sleep where you can,
Eat what you can get.
Ah! I can't; I won't; I needn't!

'But, anyway, I'll ask Him; probably it's only my fancy.'

So he began quietly, 'Good Master, what good thing shall I do?' etc. 'Keep the Commandments.' 'Hurrah! I'm reprieved: I've always done that!' Then—'One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast!'

POINT IIA.

Now, beloved, this old story of crisis, decision, failure, is ever new.

The old story of Jerusalem repeats itself in London.
You are probably *not* asked to give up all.
But you are asked quite definitely, *Will you follow Jesus?*

What do I mean by 'following Jesus'?
Two things.

(1) It is a call to give up what is wrong in your life.

Some have forgotten God { no prayers. / no worship.
Some have defied God—by open sin.

Some have been very selfish.
Some have been very weak and cowardly.
Following Jesus means giving up all this!
Of course it's hard: but it *must* be done if you would be your truest self; if you would follow Jesus.

POINT IIB.

(2) *But to follow Jesus means more than giving up sin. It is the call to a higher life: it is the working out of vocation.*

(*a*) To some it is a call to arise

from { Sin. / Sloth. / Indifference. / Godlessness.

And to advance to God.

(*b*) To others a call to { Confirmation. / Deeper devotion. / Regularity.

(*c*) To others a call to come

back to { Sacraments. / Communion. / Penance.

(*d*) To others a call to joy, the rightful inheritance of all true Christians.

(*e*) To all a call to service.

In all these cases, you yourself must ponder, think, decide.

POINT III. (Conclusion.)

Here, then, is the crisis, the decision.
Which will *you* choose?
This young man went away sorrowful.

But I remember a similar crisis with a happier ending.
From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with Jesus.
Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?
Then Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.

Here, then, is your choice.

That of the young ruler ?

That of St. Peter ?

You may go away undecided, but it will not be to peace.

So follow Jesus—and find eternal life.

INSTRUCTION—SACRAMENTS.

(The four things a child of God must do—
'A child of God must use the sacraments.')

Why MUST *a child of God use the sacraments ?*

Why ? because they convey God's grace to us.

(1) *What is grace ?*

(*cf.* St. Paul : 'By grace ye are saved.')

Grace is not easy to define—perhaps we might call it 'a supernatural gift of God to make us holy and save our souls.' It is something God gives us, and it is the source of all Christian life and power in us.

It resembles coal in a steamship, or steam in an engine, as being motive power.

(2) *How is grace imparted to man ?*

Some is given immediately by God.

But the covenanted means of grace are—

(*a*) Prayer.

(*b*) Sacraments.

In prayer Grace descends on us like dew :

In sacraments the Holy Spirit imparts to us the very Life of Christ and the means of keeping and strengthening and restoring that Life.

e.g. Baptism gives us the grace of spiritual Life in Christ.
Confirmation ,, ,, ,, Strength.
Holy Communion ,, ,, Food.
Absolution ,, ,, Cleansing.

Sacraments teach us to be humble, because it is so clear that they are God's gifts and not of our merit. Yet we must prepare for them carefully and use them gratefully. But we must remember that it is our duty, as well as our happiness, to use them, because the Lord commanded them to us, and they convey to us His grace.

FIRST THURSDAY.

SERMON—REPENTANCE.

St. Luke vii. 47 and 50:

Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much. . . . And He said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.

POINT I.

The Bible describes her as

'A woman in the city which was a sinner.'

A sinner—everybody knew it.
She knew it herself.
There was no pretence.
She was bad.

She heard this stranger preach,

And was attracted by the strong, mysterious power and goodness.

She longed to go to Him and to talk to Him.

How could she?
What would the Pharisees say?
What a talk it would make.
'I can't;—yes, I will.'—

So she stole in amid the feast.

And when she got there she didn't dare to speak.
She would touch Him.
She kissed His feet.
The Pharisee sneered.
Not much of a prophet this!

But she had got what she wanted.

For Jesus had forgiven her her sins.

POINT II.

What was it that conquered her?
What wrought that miracle?

Was it a sign—some wonder, such as the Jews were always seeking?
No: no sign.
By signs people might be startled, but not truly converted; conversion must be our choice.

The only 'sign' of Jesus was the
still small voice in the heart—
that told her He was right, that the way
of goodness is the way of peace.

It's the same with you!

For the call of Jesus is not in { marvels. / portents.

But His { words / presence / acts } are a { κρίσις / sifting } { Sifting those who are using their natural gifts from those who are not.

Are you seeking to follow
what is best in yourself?
Truth.
Holiness.
Goodness.

Then to you it shall be given—you will recognise Jesus—by His hints,
words,
still small voice.

Are you really living for yourself—satisfied
with position—the praise of men?
Then you will never attain!

Mary Magdalene, with all her sins, was longing after something better. These she saw: she understood: she asked: she was forgiven.

POINT III.

Let us leave her at the feet
of her Saviour—forgiven—in peace.
Her sins, where are they?
Gone.
Wiped out.
Forgiven.
Her repentance has brought forgiveness.
Her soul, where is it?
Welcomed back to the Father's heart,
happy, peaceful.

So to you is forgiveness offered if your repentance is real.

(*a*) Are there not some of you who remember a past of sin ?
selfishness ?

(*b*) Do you not want *forgiveness ?*
Arise—repent with a true repentance and you shall be forgiven.

STRUCTION—REPENTANCE.

(Repeat the four things, etc.)

(1) *Before a child of God can live a loving and holy life—he must repent.*

(*a*) He must get clear of the past.
(*b*) He must get back to his original baptismal covenant with God.

(2) *What is repentance ?*

(Much more than a feeling of regret.)
Three parts in a real repentance—
(1) Contrition.
(2) Confession.
(3) Satisfaction.

(*a*) *Contrition*—Finding out what you have done wrong.
Being sorry for it.

How do you find out what is wrong with you ?

Examine yourself by either—
(1) The ten commandments.
(2) The beatitudes.

How do you learn to be sorry ?

Ponder the effect of sin on God.
Yourself.
Others.

One must pray about this.
'That it may please Thee to give us true repentance.'
You must remember that the basis of sorrow is in the *will*, not only or always in the feelings.

(*b*) *Confession.*

We must tell out our sins to God.
We do this far too carelessly.
Compare John Wesley and the class-meetings.
Regarding the two kinds of confession—
Confession to God alone;
Confession to God in the presence of man—
I will speak to-morrow.

(*c*) *Satisfaction.*

Making good.
Putting up cheerfully with the consequences.
Making reparation.
A real repentance includes all these factors.

FIRST FRIDAY.

(Taken before the Sermon.)

INSTRUCTION—SACRAMENTAL ABSOLUTION.

(Repeat the four things which a child of God must do.)

POINT I.

I was talking of REPENTANCE *yesterday.*

Saying that { True repentance alone wins forgiveness. / Repentance consists of three parts.
Contrition { Finding out our sin. / Learning to be sorry for our sins.
Confession { That we tell out our sins to God—one by one.
Satisfaction { Making up for sin, if possible. / Putting up with punishment.

But connected with confession of sin and forgiveness of sin there is a controversy.

Because,

Some people say that—

(*a*) Jesus Christ gave power to His Apostles to *forgive in His Name.*

(*b*) That this power exists still in the ministers of the Church by the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

(*c*) That the Church of England encourages folk with unquiet consciences to come to those ministers and receive this absolution, on condition of repentance which is shown by confession of sins.

Other people deny this,

And think it hinders free access to God. There is a good deal of wild talk about it; let me talk to you fairly and sanely about it.

POINT II.

FIRST OF ALL.

Does God use man as His agent in spiritual things?

Yes, obviously.

Preaching.

Baptising.

Giving Communion.

In these things men act as God's agents. They do not get between the soul and God.

SECONDLY.

Did Jesus Christ give MEN

power—not only to { *teach* / *preach* } *but also to forgive sins* { *in His Name?* / *as His agents?* }

Obviously, Yes.

St. John xx. 21: As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you, etc.

But then we must never say that men can't absolve—they can, if God's agents.

THIRDLY.

Does the Church of England still tell its ministers to absolve people?

Again, Yes: see Prayer Book—

Ordering of Priests; Morning and Evening Prayer; Exhortation in H.C.; Visitation of the Sick.

If this is so, then we must never say that priests of the Church of England are dishonest or disloyal for doing what the Church of England tells them to do.

FOURTHLY.

Does the Church of England
make confession compulsory?
No—it is not compulsory.
All may come.

All unquiet consciences { *are invited to come.* / *should come.*

None are forced, over-influenced } to come.

POINT III.

What are the objections
to going to receive absolution
in this sacramental way?

(*a*) *Isn't there a danger*
of formality?
Yes, true.
But there is also a danger of formality
in Prayer.
Church-going.
Communion.
Equally in all we must be on guard.

(*b*) *Isn't it useless without*
true repentance? Quite useless.
No one should come who
Does not yet believe in it.
Is not repentant.

(*c*) *Isn't it a tyranny?*
It might be if compulsory.
As not compulsory, *No.*

POINT IV.

On the other hand,
Who are the people who
ought to come?
Penitent sinners whose consciences
are { Unquiet, / Unsatisfied,
Who wish to take Jesus at His word, to seek
His pardon through His agents,
Who are ready to face humiliation.
In a word—everybody who knows he ought to go.

Point V.

Note the naturalness of it.

Instinct of the penitent heart.
Wesleyans.
Salvation Army.
What is the difference between
Enquiry Room.
Confessional in the C. of E. ?
They claim to help and advise.
We claim to help and advise and absolve.

Think it over; it is a question for penitent sinners—other people may controvert—they will understand.

FRIDAY EVENING.

Sermon—On the Necessary Difficulty of Repentance as of all Real Religion.

St. Luke ix. 58:

The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of God hath not where to lay His head.

Point I.

It was at the end of one of His sermons!

And this man had been listening.
He caught a glimpse of another life.
Not that his own was bad, necessarily.
But a glimpse of a life shared with the Master, Who
Healed the sick; Whose
Teaching was so beautiful;
For Whom he would be content to leave home.
And carried away, he cried out—
Master, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest.
But Jesus said—
'Foxes have holes:'
'If you come with me it won't be all enthusiasm.'
'Dirty weather ahead.'
'Life has its fogs: rain: cold as well as its sunshine.'
Religion is no light thing.
It's going to cut deep.
Ah! *Easy* religions—are they *saving* religions?

A real religion demands—
Deep repentance.
Great humility.
Great joy.
Great effort.

POINT II.

Some of you may perhaps be offended because I have laid hard things before you to-night.

I have told you honestly about Absolution.
That everybody has a right to come.
That some ought to come.
Perhaps you.

Yet did you ever think
religion was going to be easy ?
Joyful, yes : but joyful after pain.
Christianity isn't only—
A sort of hearty cheerfulness,
Or a sort of respectable routine.
It contains depths of sorrows and heights of joy.

See what the Christian religion
presents to you—as the price of your peace.
For God It meant Crucifixion.
A Holy Spirit who grieves.
For us A daily cross to bear.
The flesh to be crucified.

Is it worth while ?—a thousand-fold. For through these things lie triumph, peace, joy. But easy ! *No.*

POINT III.

Foxes have holes.

Come with Jesus—but come counting the cost. Let your prayer be—not ' give me an easy religion,' but ' give me a true religion.'

FIRST SATURDAY EVENING.

SERMON—HOLY COMMUNION. (No Instruction.)

St. John vi. 55 :
For My Flesh is meat indeed.

POINT I.

If you want to understand the nature of Communion, you must understand the Nature of God.

Have you ever understood that?

Do you understand the Christian idea of God?

The Bible teaches us.

To the Jew of *Moses'* time, God was the God of Law.

To the Jew of *Isaiah's* time, God was the God of Righteousness.

To the *Christian*, God is the God of Love.

So to us God is our Father.

God is Love.

Pierce behind His Attributes and you find that He is not merely loving, but Love.

POINT IIA.

God, then, is Love.

But what is the chief attribute of love?

'*Giving*' is the chief characteristic of true love,

As '*Getting*' is the chief characteristic of self love.

God, because He loves us,

desires union with us.

He desires to give Himself to us.

'That we may dwell in Him and *He in us*.'

POINT IIB.

God, then, desires to give Himself to us.

But how does He do it?

Is it in vague ways?

Merely in the speakings to the soul of starlight nights?

The Church has always taught that God's methods of union must not be { vague / merely spiritual,

But that they are often associated with something { outward / definite / material } lest they be vague.

So : Prayer (not only aspiration, but the Lord's Prayer).
Baptism is associated with water.
Confirmation with the laying on of hands.

So in Holy Communion, the crown of all the Sacraments ; God—desiring to give Himself to you—invented His own method.

He gave Himself to His disciples on Maundy Thursday, promising that then and thereafter, by a miracle of His love, in the Breaking of Bread and drinking of the Cup, *they would find Him.*

POINT III.

One word more.

God through Jesus gives Himself to you in Holy Communion.
Yet Communion is not magic.
To be truly *in* Christ, (by Sacramental Grace)
One must be *like* Christ.
The union must not / cannot } be one-sided.
As He is : You must be :
Obedient with His obedience,
Holy with His Holiness,
Loving with His Love,
Pure with His purity.
Come then to Holy Communion,
Expecting to find Him, and
Striving to be like Him.

SECOND SUNDAY.

SERMON—CHOICE.

St. John xviii. 39 :

But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the Passover : will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews ? Then cried they all again, saying : *Not this Man, but Barabbas.*

POINT I.

Here is an instance
of a great choice.
There have been many others,
But none more terrific.

On the one side—
Jesus.
Who represented all their consciences should have acknowledged, if they had been clear and trustworthy.

On the other side—
Barabbas.
The popular—pleasant—who represented the world, the flesh.
Pilate gave them their choice, while Heaven and earth stood still and listened.
Not this Man, but Barabbas.

POINT II.

To-night the same choice is offered to you,
and before you decide finally you have a
right to understand what it will mean.
There are two Christs really,
who yet are One.

(1) *The Christ of the Cross.*
Who will give you a Cross.
Who will teach you to { suffer. / fight.
For Whom you will often be weary.
For Whom you will sometimes be persecuted.
Weigh all that!

(2) *The Loving Friend.*
For Whose sake toil, weariness, are nought.
Who will help you,
cleanse you,
lift you up to Heaven.

POINT III.

'Not this Man, but Barabbas.'

What shall we say to-night?

Once more God stoops and listens.

What will you say?

'It means a step upward.' Yes.

'It means giving up all sin.' Yes.

'It means being persecuted.' Perhaps.

'It means doing things which hurt.' Yes.

What, then, shall we answer?

Ah! let us change the faithless formula of the Jews:

'Father, we choose!'

'This Man, and *not* Barabbas.'

INSTRUCTION—THE CHURCH.

POINT I.

I have been taking for granted that
I have been speaking to Churchmen.

Yet many people who call themselves Churchmen have no idea why they are.

What is the Church?
The Catholic Church?

POINT II.

What does the Prayer Book say about the Catholic Church?

(1) I believe in the Holy Catholic Church (Apostles' Creed).

(2) I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church.

(3) More especially we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church.

(4) We have rejected all such alterations as were of dangerous consequence, as secretly striking *at some established doctrine or laudable practice* of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.—(Preface to Book of Common Prayer.)

Summary—

There is a Catholic Church in which we believe,
which we believe,
for which we pray.

The Prayer Book rejects any opinions, doctrines, which strike at the established doctrines or practices of the Church of England, or indeed of the Catholic Church.

Point III.

What, then, is this Catholic Church?

It is simply God's Brotherhood, God's Society.

What is a society?

A body of persons with officers.
rules.
proper mode of entry.
objects.
benefits.

cf. Freemasons.
Navy or Army.

The Catholic Church is God's Kingdom or Society, with its own officers, rules, mode of entry, objects, benefits.

Now for details.

(*a*) *Who founded the Catholic Church?*

Jesus. He reconstituted the Jewish Church into the Christian Church.

He wished to hand on His religion.

Some people write books.

Some people found societies.

Jesus founded a Society.

(*b*) *Who guides the Catholic Church?*

The Holy Spirit from Jesus.

Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, shall come, He will guide you unto all Truth. If I go not away the Comforter will not come.

cf. St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 15: The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth.

The Holy Spirit sustains and guides the Church.

(*c*) *What powers did Jesus give His Society?*

Jesus gave power to His Society to teach: preach: baptize: absolve: communicate, etc.; *e.g.* St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; St. John xx. 21.

(*d*) *Whom does Jesus wish to belong to His Society?*

Everybody.

The Lord added to the Church daily such as were being saved. (Acts ii. 47.)

(*e*) *How do you enter the Catholic Church?*

By Baptism, which is the ceremonial entrance into the Church, in which is also given grace to be a good Christian, if combined with conversion of heart.

cf. Catechism—Members of Christ, children of God, inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.

For its importance see:

St. Mark xvi. 16: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.

St. Peter—Acts ii. 38: Repent, and be baptized.

St. Paul: his practice at Philippi, Acts xvi. 33; at Ephesus, Acts xix. 5, etc.

Note.—It is absolutely essential to remember that the Catholic Church which we enter by Baptism is not an ordinary human society founded by Christ yet outside Him, but is strictly bound up with Christ its Head as His mystical Body and Bride.

POINT IV.

What is the Church of England?

The Church of England is a part of the Catholic Church. There are different parts, meant to be one but split: still the parts are real parts, like members of a divided family, who still belong to the family.

(In practice it consists of those baptized persons who are in living communion with the Sees of Canterbury and York.)

Compare London and the British Empire.

Just as in London you are (*a*) Citizens of London,
(*b*) Members of the British Empire,

So you are locally members of the Church of England, universally members of the Catholic Church.

Just as in London you keep
(*a*) The main laws of England,
The local laws of London,

So you should keep (*b*) The main laws { doctrines / discipline } of the Catholic Church.
The local laws of the Church of England.

Summary—

We who are members of the Church of England are members
Locally—of the Church of England,
Universally—of the Catholic Church.

Point V.

What, then, is our duty as Churchmen?
As members of the Catholic Church,
and locally of the Church of England.

(N.B.—I take it for granted that we try to be holy, etc. I am speaking now of our duties as churchmen.)

(1) *First, we loyally keep the fundamentals of the Catholic Church—*

Bible.
Creeds.
Ministry.
Sacraments.

(2) *Secondly, we keep the rules and customs of the Catholic Church—*

e.g. Fasting Communion—to break which is not necessarily wicked, but may be self-opinionated and conceited.

(3) *Thirdly, we keep the rules and customs of the Church of England—*

Services in the vernacular.
Communion at least three times a year.
Friday abstinence, etc.

Summary—

We need—

(1) To realise our glorious heritage: members of the Great Society, the Catholic Church.

(2) To be more obedient children of the Church and to find pleasure, *not* in breaking the customs of the Church, but in being *obedient children* of the Church.

SECOND MONDAY.

SERMON—CHRISTIAN FRUITS.

Galatians v. 22 :

The fruit of the Spirit is love, *joy*, peace.

POINT I.

There are certain words that only religious people can understand.

Holiness.

We cannot explain it.

Yet when we meet a holy person we know it.

Such have the atmosphere of a person standing near to God.

Only religious folk understand it.

Devotion.

The love of God.

(How can a person love God ? Yet they do.)

You see a person in church kneeling—Devotion.

You meet a person going through life with face turned to God—Devotion.

Yet only a religious person can understand it.

POINT II.

But there is a word not only religious but peculiarly Christian which many Christians do not understand.

Joy.

The happiness, merriment, laughter, peace } of being Christians.

Of knowing we are { Accepted. Redeemed. Helped.

Yet many Christians have never found out ' Holy Joy.'

They are { gloomy. careworn. dull.

At best their religion makes them endure.

They are like people who have never discovered the ' beautiful ' in Nature or Art.

POINT III.

How can you, beloved, get holy joy?

(1) *It isn't far off.*

It's a better jewel than stones, gold.
You needn't go to Kimberley for it.
It lies in your own garden.

(2) *There are four conditions to fulfil.*

(*a*) You must know God loves you.
(*b*) You must know that you love God.
(*c*) You must know your hearts are pure—in innocence or by penitence.
(*d*) You must know that you are helping others.

If you fulfil these conditions you may have dark days, but the world will be full of joy.

Let us up: fulfil the conditions, show forth as good advertisements of Christianity, the love, joy, peace, of the Holy Spirit.

INSTRUCTION—FURTHER NOTES ON THE HOLY SACRIFICE AND THE SACRAMENTS.

The Holy Sacrifice.

(God worshipped by sacrifice, see Instruction 3.)

POINT I.

(*a*) *Analysis of the meaning of a Jewish Sacrifice.*

e.g. The Passover.

The Lamb { Offered to God. / Given back by God. / Partaken of by man as a symbol of renewed friendship.

(*b*) *Fulfilment in the Holy Eucharist.*

We offer the Body and Blood of Jesus to God.
God gives Him back to us for Communion.
We partake of the Body and Blood in renewed friendship.
Therefore the Holy Eucharist is both sacrifice and sacrament, in which we first worship, then partake.

POINT II.

Baptism.

(Drawn out as the enlistment into the Army of Christ with power given to be a good soldier. Also as membership in the mystical Body of Christ: another branch incorporated into the Vine.)

Confirmation.

(Taught as the sacrament of strength imparted by the gift of the Holy Ghost with his sevenfold graces.)[1]

SECOND TUESDAY

CONCLUDING SERMON—ENCOURAGEMENT.

St. Luke xii. 32:

Fear not, little flock; it is My Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.

POINT I.

Strange are God's ways of dealing with His Friends.

For some a short, sharp contest—
St. John Baptist.
St. James.
St. Stephen.

Others live long—
St. John—The life at Ephesus.
Waiting.
Watching.

But whether the life be short and sharp,
whether it be long and watching,
Equally
'Fear not, little Flock,'
'I am with you always.'

POINT IIA.

Now there may be some people who are saying, 'Ah! it's all very well while the Mission lasts, but I shall drop back afterwards.'

Now, don't croak!
Go back? How silly!

[1] Drawn out in full in *Is Confirmation any use?* (Mowbray, 1*d*.)

To talk of ' going back ' means
one of two things.

(*a*) That God is faithless.
Is it likely God would help us and then drop us ?
He is with us always.

(*b*) That we are worms.
People who want to be petted.
Who can't stand a little rough weather.
Honestly, would you like an easy time till you die ? Surely not.

POINT IIB.

What is it, then, to-night we shall ask God for ?
We shall ask God for
a robust religion ;
a sound, strong religion.
Mind you, you don't always get it.
Look at the people who
Drop off when ' the Vicar ' goes.
Is their religion robust ?
Or the people who drop off
after a Mission.
Is their religion robust ?
Or the people who leave their Church and go to a new district and give up.
Is their religion robust ?
Or the people who drop off
when they are tempted.
Is their religion robust ?

POINT III.

Well, perhaps you say—
Give me the recipe for a robust religion.
(1) *Get straight first :*
Repentance : Faith.
i.e. Sins absolved.
Right attitude to God.
Joy and energy.

(2) *Regularity.*

Make your main rules.

Prayer.
Worship.
Communion.
Confession.

(3) *The spirit of thankfulness and joy.*

It keeps our religion from getting stale and dry.
When feeling dry, thank God for what He has given you.

Let us pray : (For a deep religion.)

INSTRUCTION—TEMPTATION.

(1) *It is very hard to resist.*

It is hard for all.
All of us have our own temptations and difficulties.
Yet our Lord had to meet it.
St. Paul had it—would we be without it ?

(2) *Remember, first,* TEMPTATION *is not* SIN.

Sin is Temptation consented to.
We might be tempted continually and yet not sin at all.
The devil knocks : he needn't enter.

(3) *There is a use in temptation.*

It produces heroes, saints.
cf. early Christians.
We have ours which correspond to theirs.

(4) *How to resist temptation.*

(1) Keep out of it. (Bad places, companions, books, papers.)
(2) Ejaculatory prayer. (Gaze at Jesus.)
(3) Fight.

The Cross now. One day the Crown. Let us try.[1]

[1] I should like to emphasise that the above Mission course is only a sort of rough specimen guide, and by no means intended to be followed in all its details.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PRIEST'S DIFFICULTIES AND TEMPTATIONS

THERE are many temptations which we priests share in common with all other men. It is absurd to think that because we are ordained we cease to be men. Like other men we are open to the snares of passion, and we must be careful, as all good men are, to be watchful, sensible, and self-restrained. We are not wicked because we are tempted, yet we are foolish if we imagine ourselves safe. For example—inasmuch as the Church of England undoubtedly intended at the Reformation to allow the priests of her communion to marry—we have to remember that friendships, which for a Roman priest are never expected to end in anything but friendship, must be regarded by us as something which may strike very much deeper at any moment. So we have need to be careful for other people's sake as well as our own.

The whole question of clerical marriage and celibacy is most difficult. One or two points are quite clear, viz. that in the early Church married men were priests (as in the Eastern and Uniat Churches to-day), but that in all known cases marriage preceded ordination.

Equally clear it is that the 'local rules' of the Church of England contemplate marriage as permissible at any time, 'if it serves to Godliness.' Celibacy doubtless is a great sacrifice, and if made from worthy motives—such as obedience to what is considered true Church Order, or out of desire to be quite free for some special work—produces high and noble characters, whose case is plainly covered by Christ's own words about men who should give up 'wife or children for His Name and the Gospel's.' Yet a little observation will prove that by no means all who are celibates are saints. Whether the results of celibacy are good or bad on the whole is a difficult question to answer.[1] I prefer not to give any judgment, and I would rather leave it to the individual to weigh the pros and cons very carefully, and decide which is his vocation. I use the word vocation particularly, as some people seem to regard only celibacy as worthy of association with the epithet 'vocation,' apparently regarding marriage as a mere concession to comfort, convenience, or passion. That I will never believe. A vocation to marriage seems to me frequent, noble, holy.

But as to whether a man or woman is called to marriage I dare not judge: God and the soul must settle it between themselves, though I think in the case of a priest he should weigh all considerations much more carefully than is usually done, and should not

[1] I am rightly reminded that this is a matter in which the efficiency of the Church as a whole must be considered, as well as the claims or needs of the individual priest.

drift into matrimony as necessarily part and parcel of an ordinary cleric's life. God may be asking this particular sacrifice.

But I would say to celibates this—with humility. Celibacy is not the mere denial of happiness and satisfaction to the domestic instincts. If that is all, it is damnable: a mere suppression of life and joy and human love. If it is a condition of a wider and more generous love, of God, of the poor, the outcast, the lost, the fallen: if, in short, it makes priests more loving men, if it widens the circle of their work, their tenderness, their love—then, and then only, is it justified.

And to the married man I would say this—with humility. It looks as if it were possible to be so content with one's domestic life that work becomes just an annex to home life instead of the first passion of a man's life. It looks sometimes as if a strong wall were built round the vicarage, wherein the intensest interests lie, while the spiritual affairs of the parish are matters of interest and care, but not of white-hot enthusiam. Failure is not an agony, success not a matter of purest and acutest thanksgiving. It looks as if marriage made some priests rather humdrum about their work, and therefore content with respectability and the uninspired performance of duty. I dare not dogmatise or generalise, but I venture to guess that some married priests would do well to think this over.

But there are other more general difficulties which we find in our work. The very nature of religion is a

difficulty. It is so little a matter of demonstration: you cannot make a job of it. You cannot seize people and force religion down their throat. They must experiment for themselves, and see for themselves. This is true of all spiritual things; you cannot prove them in a brutal, off-handed way; men must arrive at vision, their eyes must be opened. We don't bother about this in matters of music or art; if people wake up to the appreciation of beauty, well and good; if not, it doesn't matter much. But in religion it is different: you feel it matters so intensely, and matters for all. And yet you cannot rush things. You have to plod on and talk away and wait developments. It is very trying, and we are apt to lose heart, yet we must not.

Then, again, there is so much ignorance. I don't mean only ignorance of Church history or Bible-teaching, though that is bad enough. I mean ignorance of what religion really is—its noble and simple basis of friendship with a Holy and Loving God. Religion is regarded as a kind of fad indulged in by leisured persons, or else as something too remote for people to take seriously. You will find that a large part of your teaching consists of removing misapprehensions and evil growths from religion, vindicating the holiness of God and showing the rightness and reality of religion if man truly has a soul. You will find that God is regarded as an arbitrary despot, sin as an artificial transgression of unnecessary laws, redemption as unneeded. And even among professedly religious people you may find intense

narrowness and a prevalence of harsh judgments and acid criticisms of others, and others' religion. Again, you will find widespread ignorance about the Incarnation, while the doctrine of the Church, and the connection of sacramental life with the glorified Humanity of Jesus, is practically not understood at all. I do not mean that all your people must become competent theologians, yet I should have thought that most of the disputes in the Church of England of the last eighty years, and the widespread disuse of Holy Communion, were evidence enough that our people need better teaching concerning the Church and the Sacraments than they have hitherto received.

Once more, we shall find only too much of religious controversy and bitterness. Personally, I am glad to say I have seen little of it lately, since at Oxford it hardly exists. Yet none of us, however favourably placed, can escape it long or altogether. Wretched disputes about High Church and Low Church; scenes where—

> 'The atmosphere may grow mephitic,
> Where Papist struggles with Dissenter;'

districts where religious leaders are not even on speaking terms will come your way, alas!

And yet you will find that every party and set has something true to say, some secret to guard. The most Catholic Church will be the one which safeguards most or all of these secrets. It is better to

put out of one's mind altogether that any large body of earnest persons is completely wrongheaded and perverse. What keeps them together is something true. And indeed most of them started from the necessity (as it seemed to them) to re-assert some forgotten principle or truth.

In our relationship with other bodies it is well to remember this. Dolling could say that he thanked God there were five strong centres of nonconformity in his Portsmouth district. Many of us who remain in the Church of England thank God there is the Roman Catholic Church. Dolling meant that amid the almost universal paganism of his district, with which the Church of England had failed to cope, he was thankful for the presence of those who at least believed in God, in Christ, in Baptism, in conversion, in goodness. When we thank God for the Roman Church it does not mean that we are grateful for ultramontane theories of the Pope, but that we are thankful that so vast a body of Christians believes so utterly in the Incarnation, in the Sacraments, in the reality of the supernatural life. I think our best attitude towards controversy springs from the conviction that the Church of England holds truly to the two essentials—the need of inward conversion, and the necessity of objective realities and Means of Grace such as the Church and the Sacraments. At the same time we are sad that she has held together these truths so feebly in her practical life. We have little ground for boasting about the Church

of England, although we may be truly convinced that for us she is the nearest approach to truth that we can find.

Therefore we meet controversy humbly, yet confidently—but always with charity.

For here at least is the one utterly unchristian error,—bitterness. That must be wrong. Our Lord said very little about the Church, but much about love. If we feel we are beginning to speak or think bitterly or discourteously to or about other religious bodies or persons, let us stop. We may be accidentally right ; yet we are essentially wrong.

Personally I would advise any of my friends to get to know all sorts on a basis of equality. Get to know the Roman priest ; ask the Primitive Methodist to lunch, and the Seventh Day Adventist to high tea—if he likes that terrible meal. From knowing them, listening to them, liking them, praying with them, you will be saved from that awful barren ecclesiasticism from which some of us have suffered. I hold it the main utility of places like Swanwick that you find what true lovers of Jesus are those men whom you have only known of, in the past, under the unprepossessing names of Nonconformist, Separatist, Dissenter.

But none the less these difficulties of separation are real difficulties. The points between us do matter. And our difficulty is to solve the problem how to be true to right principles, and yet be in love and charity with those who—in good faith—belittle them or deny them.

Such, then, will be some of our difficulties in the new parish. What are our dangers? I mean our special dangers as priests. I think they mainly come from the failure to maintain an ideal. For a priest's ideal must be high. It includes a vigorous mind and a deep spiritual interior life. Yet think how hard these are to maintain: it means regular reading, hard thinking, persistent praying. And from the very irregularity of the parish priest's life he lives in constant temptation to fall short. Therefore I would put sloth as the first of the priest's temptations. The terrible clerical scandals one hears of never fall out of a blue sky: the clouds have gathered first—clouds of sloth and desultoriness. Drink and other sins of the flesh most frequently attack the unoccupied. The remedy for them is regular work, as I have tried to emphasise earlier in this book. We should read systematically. Yet many a newly ordained priest might ask how he is to know what to read. I have learned[1] that a most fruitful line of reading for a priest lies in a division of subjects into (1) the Bible, (2) Church history, (3) big books on big subjects. We ought to know far more about our Bibles than we do: that is where Nonconformists beat us. We know incredibly little about Church history. And for big books or big subjects there lie to our hand the works of Bishop Butler, Dr. Illingworth, Dean Church, Dr. Liddon, Dr. Moberly, Bishops Gore and Westcott and Lightfoot, and

[1] From Dr. Stone.

many others. Then we should know much more about the nature and extent of missionary work and life. There are vast subjects, such as mysticism, of fascinating interest. Even if we had no other guide, we could take in the 'Church Quarterly Review,' and pursue the subjects, and read some of the books of which that journal treats. But reading there *must* be. It is the sin of sloth if we fail. While people around us are talking of philosophy, criticism, modernism, apologetics, are we to be the most ignorant?

Then, again, there is the danger of deadness and spiritual dryness. That comes from want of prayer. For in truth without prayer we are like a steamship without coal. People complain of religious sterility, maintain that the Christian life is impossible, and so on, yet their arguments simply witness to the fact that religious vitality and energy are impossible if we lean only on natural inclinations or gifts. It is only by drawing on supernatural sources and resources that we get going and keep going; that is, by the use of prayer and sacramental grace. Every morning we must coal up, or else we shall get no move on. So if you as a priest shorten, neglect, omit prayer, at once deadness begins and the ideal recedes. I do not deny that there are special cases where ill-health or nervous troubles or special trials from God bring on temporary dryness. But I am persuaded that, normally, the root evil is want of serious and persistent prayer.

And another result of the loss of ideals is the

arrival of the spirit of grumbling. No hardworking man who prays ever grumbles. He hasn't time for it. He may criticise, denounce, reform, but he does not have a perpetual grievance against the universe. And grumbling is so wrong because it draws cheques on the balance of other people's vitality. You are always a worse man after being with a grumbler. Deal with him as Nehemiah dealt with the relation of Tobiah, and chase him from you. If you find yourself in a clergy-house with a grumbler, go into lodgings : it's much safer.

Yet another great danger is to become unnatural. You see, people treat us so unfairly sometimes. Some condemn us off-hand as pestilent priests when we do not really deserve it. Others treat us as holy and infallible saints, whereas we are just very fallible young men who are trying to be good, and to do a little good before we die. This treatment tends to make us self-conscious—a grave clerical fault. The only way, as I have said before, is to keep your eye on God and live by His approval alone, and to retain your power to laugh at yourself, and then go straight ahead and do what you think best without worrying about anybody. That will save you from posing, or keeping up an attitude instead of being your own natural self. That will save you from many bad mistakes, including that awful clerical voice, and the clerical attitude, and the clerical manner, which are best avoided, not by direct resistance, but by not thinking about them at all. And lastly I would

point out the danger of becoming dominating. Although many people look upon us with suspicion (which I fear we sometimes justify), yet there is generally a small number of persons who look up to us as authorities. And very often, in some parishes, we are the most educated people there. The result is that we get to look for a deference, a submission to our judgment, totally out of proportion to our real value in the scheme of things. We want to be treated differently from other people. Others may—so to speak—sit at long tables and scramble for tea and cake, but we want our own little table near the fire spread with a few additional comforts. Hence our insufferable claim to dictate, to criticise, when we have no more right to interfere than anyone else has.

Clergy are sometimes unpopular in hotels, in railway carriages—they are almost always unpleasant in large gatherings; it all arises from the fact that the deference which some of our people pay to us has spoilt us a bit, and made us think we can behave with less than the self-effacing courtesy of the average gentleman. We are forced to be prominent—in the pulpit and elsewhere—we must be so very careful lest we become dominant. Humility becomes all men, most of all a Christian priest.

And now at the end of this little book, which I write for the benefit—as I trust—of my many friends at Oxford who have listened to me so kindly and treated me so handsomely, I would ask leave to say just this. I have written sometimes dogmatic-

ally, sometimes critically; yet my intention is very far from being dogmatic or critical. I write as being conscious of so many failures and mistakes from which I would, if I could, save others. And I write for an ideal from which I have myself constantly swerved in practice, but never in intention. And though, even at the moment that I write, my future life as a priest is quite indeterminate, and I know that many temptations and difficulties lie ahead, yet I still do homage to the ideal of a Christian priest, and believe it to be as noble a life as a man can lead.

I pray God for myself and my brother-priests and all who shall yet be ordained that He will give us grace to persevere to the end, that we may follow Jesus, the Pattern, the Ideal, the Master of all Christian people and all Christian priests, in Whom alone we can find true happiness, peace, and power.

THE END

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., COLCHESTER
LONDON AND ETON

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
A 18207

BV
660
C3

Carey, Walter Julius, Bp., b.1875.
My priesthood. London, New York, Longmans, Green, 1915.
xi, 155p. 21cm.

1. Clergy--Office. I. Title.

A18207

CCSC/mmb

A18207